



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Running head: SPORTSWEAR AS COMMUNICATION

Master's Thesis of Global Sport Management

**Sportswear as Communication : A
Comparison Between Identity Signaling
and How They are Perceived**

February 2018

**Seoul National University
Graduate School of Physical Education
Global Sport Management Major
Jisuk Chang**

Abstract

Physical appearance is the most readily available visual cue in first impression situations and can thus influence the judgments and subsequent behavior of the perceiver. Clothing has been singled out by many researchers as a powerful aspect of physical appearance that is highly expressive in nature. However most clothing and first impression studies either have forcefully categorized clothing choices into broad categories (e.g., casual look, sporty look, professional look, etc.) or have been manipulated to best represent the clothing category or self-identity of the wearer. Also, to this day, to the best of my knowledge, there has not been any research on the everyday sportswear choices of sports participants and their communicative aspects.

Along these lines, the current study is, based on person perception and social identity theory, an attempt to provide some insight as to the signaling aspects of sportswear as well as how these signals are perceived and interpreted to make first impression judgments by observers. More specifically, the study looks to compare the intentions and human brand personality of sportswear consumers with judgments made by perceivers about the social identity, self-identity and personality traits of the wearer in a first impression setting. The study looked to compare how first impressions of sports club participants differ according to the type of clothing (active, casual, and non-sportswear) that they were wearing as well

as comparing the self-perceptions with the first impression ratings of observers. Finally, the study compared the first impression judgments between the types of sport (basketball, baseball, soccer, and weightlifting).

Results showed that active sportswear wearers are non-sportswear wearers were rated higher on almost all aspects than casual sportswear wearers. Furthermore, the self-perceptions of sports club participants were significantly higher than the first impression ratings made by observers. Finally, there were significant differences between the first impressions based on the sport type. The applied and theoretical implications of the study findings are discussed along with future directions for research.

Keywords: Sportswear, Person Perception Theory, Social Identity Theory, First Impression, Human Brand Personality

Student Number: 2015-21655

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Contents	3
List of Tables	6
List of Figures	8
Chapter 1. Introduction	9
1.1. Research Background	9
1.2. Purpose of the Study	12
1.3. Significance of Study	13
1.4. Definition of Terms	15
Chapter 2. Theoretical Background	19
2.1. Person Perception Theory	21
2.1.1. Target Variables	24
2.1.2. Clothing Variables	26
2.1.3. Perceiver Variables	26
2.1.4. Fashion Consciousness	27

SPORTSWEAR AS COMMUNICATION	4
2.2. Social Identity Theory	29
2.2.1. Optimal Distinctiveness Theory	30
2.2.2. Need to Belong	31
2.2.3. Need for Uniqueness	32
2.3. Self-identity and Athletic Identity	33
2.4. Human Brand Personality	34
2.5. Research Questions	37
Chapter 3. Method	38
3.1. Participants	38
3.1.1. Target Participants	38
3.1.2. Observer Participants	39
3.2. Procedure	39
3.2.1. Target Participants' Procedure	39
3.2.2. Observer Participants' Procedure	41
3.3. Instrumentation	42
Chapter 4. Results	48
4.1. Descriptive Analysis	48
4.2. Comparison of First Impressions between Clothing Categories	53

SPORTSWEAR AS COMMUNICATION	5
4.3. Comparison between Self-perceptions and First Impressions	65
4.4. Comparisons between the First Impressions by Sport Type	74
Chapter 5. Discussion	78
5.1. General Discussion	78
5.1.1. Comparisons between Clothing Categories	78
5.1.2. Comparisons between Self-perceptions and First Impressions	83
5.1.3. Comparisons of Impressions between Type of Sport	84
5.2. Implications	85
5.2.1. Theoretical Implications	85
5.2.2. Practical Implications	86
5.3. Limitations and Directions for Future Research	87
5.4. Conclusion	88
References	90
Appendix	108

List of Tables

Table 1. Need to belong questionnaire items	44
Table 2. Consumers' need for uniqueness questionnaire items	44
Table 3. Athletic identity questionnaire items	45
Table 4. Fashion consciousness questionnaire items	46
Table 5. Human brand personality traits questionnaire items	47
Table 6. Demographics of study participants	49
Table 7. Summary of key variables	51
Table 8. Cronbach's α reliability test results	53
Table 9. Skewness and kurtosis analysis by clothing category	54
Table 10. Results of Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality	55
Table 11. Levene's test for equality of variance	57
Table 12. One-way ANOVA results	58
Table 13. Post-hoc test results	59
Table 14. Kruskal-Wallis test of equality of medians	61
Table 15. Welch and Brown-Forsythe robust tests of equality of means	62
Table 16. Skewness and kurtosis results	66
Table 17. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality results	67
Table 18. Independent samples t-test results	68
Table 19. Mann-Whitney U test results	69
Table 20. Active sportswear independent samples t-test results	70

Table 21. Casual sportswear independent samples t-test results	71
Table 22. Non- sportswear independent samples t-test results	72
Table 23. One-way ANOVA results	75
Table 24. Tukey post-hoc test results for significant variables	76

List of Figures

Figure 1. Sample images of target participants.....	41
---	----

Introduction

Research Background

Like the saying “you never get a second chance to make a first impression,” judgments made about others are an important part of human interaction, as we are faced with numerous first impression situations on a daily basis. Hence, both practitioners and scholars have long been concerned with the underlying processes and contents of social perceptions (Burns & Lennon, 1993). In first encounter situations, physical appearance is the most readily available piece of information as they require no prior interaction between the observer and target person. Physical appearances therefore act as visual cues that can powerfully influence the perceptions of the observers’ as well as their subsequent behavior and attitudes towards the target person (Efran, 1974; Todorov, Mandisodza, Goren & Hall, 2005; Snyder, Tanke & Bercheild, 1977; Zebrowitz, 1996). For example, Efran (1974) found that although the jurors that were polled replied that physical attractiveness should not influence their decisions in a court setting, however, results showed that the verdicts of the male respondents were biased and favored the more attractive female defendant.. Likewise, Snyder, Tanke, and Bercheid (1977) found that when respondents were asked to make inferences of competence with one second exposure to U.S. congressional candidates’ facial portraits, they were able to predict the

outcomes of the elections better than by chance.

As such, seeking to express oneself through their appearance can be viewed as the flip side to the same coin. Of the many aspects of physical appearance, researchers have identified clothing as a significant non-verbal expressive tool (Nielsen & Kernaleguen, 1976), that acts as a social symbol and is used by individuals in identity definition (Feinberg, Mataro & Burroughs, 1992). Clothing can be an especially significant self-expressive tool because: (1) clothing is used in daily activity, (2) clothes constitute a frequent public display, and (3) clothing choice can be easily manipulated, and therefore, what you choose to wear will communicate a complex array of information about who you are to others around you (Howlett, Pine, Orakcioglu & Fletcher, 2013), regardless of whether or not the information is intended or not.

In a sports context, clothing serves a wide range of both intended and unintended purposes for both athletes and fans. Clothing that is tailored to the needs of athletes and specific sports can enhance the performance of the user, such as products like compression clothing and biomimetic swimwear. Likewise, aesthetic aspects such as style and fit have also been shown to provide a psychological edge when users perceive themselves as dressed “correctly” for the given sport (Feather, Ford & Herr, 1996).

Another aspect of sports clothing is its relation to an individual’s personal sense of social and self-identity. As noted by Swenson (1973),

participation in sports can be viewed as acting out one of many social roles that an individual accumulated throughout their life. Also, the various roles which an individual assumes affect the creation, retention and renewal of self-identity. Kleine et al. (1993) also makes a distinction between roles and identities, where “roles are the norms and behaviors that are expected from various positions in society, while identities are the multiple social labels by which an individual is recognized by him/herself and by others.” Kleine et al. (1993) further notes that identities that are most salient are acted out more frequently than less important identities.

The ties between self and social identities for college students may be especially important. A wide variety of studies have noticed the college years as an important stage in identity formation and expression of such identities (Arnett, 2000; Luyckx, Goossens, & Soenens, 2006; Waterman, 1993). Luyckx et al. (2010) notes that “college is a period in life in which individuals are confronted with developing an integrated and self-endorsed identity and making plans and preparing for the future.” In other words, college is a period in which individuals constantly explore different identities and prepare for adulthood (Nurmi, Poole, & Seginer, 1995). Therefore, along with the choice of major, extracurricular activities and clubs play an essential role in the identity formation of college students. It is a time when individuals find which groups to associate with and other groups to differentiate themselves from. Also, according to a survey by Albamon, a

part-time job employment and recruitment service company, sports and leisure clubs were ranked 2nd in the list of most frequently joined college sports clubs.

Based on the above information, sports club participants will view the particular social group as salient and thus place a high importance on their athletic or sport identity. Thus, this salient identity will be portrayed through behavior, and given that sports and clothing/sportswear have close ties, such athletic identities may be expressed through clothing and sportswear consumption choices.

Furthermore, in the current digital age of connectivity through the internet, social networking, social dating, and smartphones, photographs are now an extremely common feature of everyday life, and opportunities to post and view the physical appearance of individuals easily accessible. Consumers in today's day and age are increasingly seeking many different lifestyles as well as expressing such lifestyles through the use of photographs and video clips, and the importance and sheer number of first-impressions are great.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study is to determine the similarities and differences between the self-perception and self-image portrayal intentions of sportswear wearers and the first impressions formed by

observers of these sportswear wearers. Secondly, we aim to determine factors that affect both the identity signaler as well as the perceiver of said signals. More specifically, we would like to investigate how the social identity and personality variables of the sportswear wearers are manifested in sportswear choice, as well as how the same variables on the perceivers' side affects their perceptions of the sportswear wearers.

As mentioned, though briefly, above, most clothing and first impression studies have forcefully categorized the targets into broad style categories such as casual looks, preppy looks, professional looks, sporty looks, etc. However in the real world, fashion and clothing choices do not always have such a definitive distinction between styles. Therefore we felt a need for research that took a more narrow look into clothing choice and first impression situations by limiting the clothing category to sportswear, and sub-dividing sportswear into smaller categories according to style.

Sportswear was the category of choice due to the relative distinctiveness of the sportswear category that has definite brands that are specifically for sportswear (Nike, Adidas, Under Armour, etc.) as well as uses in a variety of situations (sports participation, sports spectating, casual wear, comfort, etc.).

Significance of Study

In the process of fulfilling the purpose of the study, we make several contributions to the existent literature. First, the current study is the

first study to investigate the identity signaling, coding, and reception through the use of sportswear. (elaborate)

Moreover, the current study partially answers the call for future research by Lennon et al. (2014) by investigating the perceiver variables that affect person perception. As well as a call for studies focusing on specific categories of clothing style. The investigation of perceiver variables is a notable contribution in that although there is a general agreement that clothing choice is a form of communication, few studies have identified which aspects of the perceiver affect the different interpretations of the same clothing stimuli. Also, by focusing on a specific category of clothing (sportswear), we are optimistic about attaining deeper insight as to the communication of sports identities and how they are perceived by observers with both sports interests as well as those without.

Finally, the current study adds to the literature of both sportswear and fashion in general by using real world uses of clothing, rather than artificially manipulating clothing stimuli to fit pre determined categories. This allows for insight as to the overall impression formation and perception rather than the sum of its parts (i.e., brand A + brand B).

In more practical terms, insights on how sportswear consumption in everyday consumption is perceived can have significant managerial implications. Results of a marketing survey by MarketingCharts.com showed that 59% of respondents stated that the first impressions of brands

where critical to their brand loyalty. Considering that everyday users of brands are in fact walking, talking, real-life advertising channels of brands (especially for clothing as they are readily visible), knowing how the products are perceived by the observers can aid in making important managerial and marketing decisions. One example may be decisions on which types of sports to target and which styles of active or street sportswear can enhance or tweak the brand image to relevant (high sports involvement consumers), as well as potential customers. Also, further research into a wider variety of sports can aid brand in making major decisions as to what types of sports lines portfolios sportswear brands should produce to best complement existing brand images and make meaningful first impressions.

In the ensuing sections, the definition of terms used in the current study, followed by literature on identity signaling, person perception, clothing research, social identity, personality traits and states, and research questions are discussed. Next, the research methodology used to answer the research questions are described.

Definition of Terms

Appearance : Appearance is the visual aspects of an individual that takes into account “body features, movements, and positions, as well as the visible body modifications and supplements of dress” (Roach-Higgins &

Eicher, 1992, p13). Therefore, appearance can be understood as the overall visual aspects which include both static features (such as clothing, body modifications, height, weight, etc.) and dynamic features (facial expressions, posture, etc.).

Clothing : Clothing is part of dress but is restricted to “the assemblage of items that happen to cover the body in some way” (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992, p.13). This definition is similar to dress, however it excludes direct body modifications.

Dress : Dress is “an assemblage of body modifications and/or supplements to the body” (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992, p.15). Therefore dress includes all possible direct modifications of the body (e.g., hairstyle, tatoos, ear piercings, scented breath, etc.) as well as garments (jewelry, accessories, wrist watches, etc.).

Fashion : Fashion refers to many different kinds of material and non-material cultural products. It can be defined as “a preailing custom a current usage; especially one characteristic of a particular place or period of time” (Kaiser, 1997, p. 12). or “the mode of dress, etiquette, furniture, style of speech, etc., adopted in society for the time being.” (same book).

Identity : Identity is “the organized set of characteristics perceived as

representing or defining the self in social situations” (Kaiser, 1990, p. 186).

Code : Code, for the purpose of this thesis, is defined as “the knowledge that is shared by the addressor and addressee of a clothing message in order for the former to create the message and the later to understand it” (McCracken & Roth, 1989, p. 14).

Signal and Signaling : A signal can be defined as a compact indicator of some set of information that is hard to observe or summarize. (Jonah & Chip, 2008). Signaling is the act of sending out signals, and this can be done both consciously and unconsciously.

Athletic Identity : Athletic identity is defined as the degree of strength and exclusivity to which a person identifies with the athletic role (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1991).

Human Brand : For the purpose of the current thesis, we use a modified version of Thomson’s (2006) definition as “any persona who is the subject of communications effort(s).”

Semiotics : Semiotics, according to Palmer (1993), is described as “the theory of signs, or of signaling systems.” In Palmer’s definition, the “signs”

are not limited to linguistic signs, but any form of communication, whether intended or not, including visual non-verbal communication, such as clothing and fashion choices.

Theoretical Background

The Communicative Aspects of Clothing

Of the many reasons why consumers consume various products, past research indicates that people tend to prefer products that carry symbolic meanings that are aligned with their perceived personal or social identity (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Furby, 1978; Solomon, 1983).

While individuals use a variety of cues to infer identity, some cues are used more readily than others when it comes to inferring identities of others (Belk, 1981). Many researchers have explicitly studied clothing as an example of a product category that has high social identity congruence, and self-expressive qualities (Bull, 1975; Davis, 1984; Kaiser, 1985). For example, clothing is unique in that it possesses qualities such as being used everyday by everybody, there is such a wide variety of clothing (i.e., color, style, brand, fit, etc.) for individuals to choose from and customize, and clothing is displayed publically. Also, clothing, along with physical features such as facial features, hair style, posture, etc., are all readily visible and does not require any form of interaction between two individuals and in most cases it only takes a fraction of a second for first impressions to be formed (Todorov, Pakrashi & Oosterhof, 2009). For this reason, most clothing studies are conducted in a first impression setting with limited exposure to the clothed subject. Prolonged exposure may allow for the observers to pick up on non-clothing related cues and add biases in forming

first impressions. Clothing studies on first impressions have predominately focused on two factors: (1) the observable traits of the subject being viewed and (2) personality/preferences of the observer viewing the subject (Burns & Lennon, 1993). This indicates that the traits of the subject influence the observers' judgments, while personal characteristics of the observer influence how the traits are interpreted and the hierarchy of which traits are important in their judgments of the subject, especially when there are no verbal interactions between the subject and observer.

One of the first studies to investigate the signaling aspects of clothing was conducted by Paul Hamid (1969). The study looked into the differences in the ratings of different clothing styles. The four clothing style categories were: (1) school uniform, (2) casual attire, (3) work attire, and (4) evening attire. The results showed small differences in ratings about attractiveness, happiness and honesty. However, a shortcoming of the study was that Hamid did not omit the faces of the models in the stimulus material, and therefore results may have been biased due to the facial features influencing the ratings of perceivers. Since the purpose of the study is to examine identity signaling in sportswear consumption, facial features were omitted from this study with a strict focus on clothing and intended signals of the wearer and interpretation by the observer.

Nielsen and Kernaleguen (1976) examined the interpretation of physical appearance and facial attractiveness by using pictures of facial

images and clothed bodies. The facial images from a college yearbook, while the clothed body images were taken from various fashion magazines with the faces having been removed. The results showed that the responses to the facial images showed a wider range of variance than did the images of the clothed bodies, due to the fact that the faces provided information that was highly expressive. The results may have also been influenced by the fact that most people share an understanding about the different messages that facial expressions or facial features signal, but knowledge about some aspects of clothing are shared by specific groups.

Clothing is associated with a wide network of meanings and values, and is connected to norms of many groups. In time, clothing signals develop to become a part of the historical culture and social identity of a group of people, and these signals come to represent that group's culture gains value in such a context (Barthes, 1972). In other words, to people outside these contexts, messages and meanings of clothing may be meaningless. Therefore it is important in clothing research to include a diverse population to attempt to compare how different groupings influence the interpretation of clothing signals.

Person Perception Theory

Person perception theory can be defined as "how individual perceivers select, interpret and integrate information about other people"

(Smith & Collins, 2009). When applied to clothing literature, person perception is often referenced to describe the “cognitive processes used to make judgments of others based upon their appearance” (Kaiser, 1997). The key notion in person perception theory is that people can make inferences about others’ in areas such as personality characteristics, work ability, employment potential and many other specific qualities on the basis of a limited number of non-verbal cues (Tagiuri, 1969). Also, an integral part of person perception theory and impression formation is categorization.

Considering that our natural world provides us with a vast amount of stimuli every second, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to register every single piece of information as separate individual items. Therefore, instead of treating all object as individually different, people tend to group objects into categories (Rosch, 1973). This is the natural process in which humans reduce and organize the complex world around us (Hamilton, 1979). Some of the psychological properties regarding grouping and categorization can be found in Gestalt Theory. Gestalt theory states that people organize perceptions by perceptually grouping objects utilizing the two processes of assimilation (perceiving similarities between objects) and contrast (perceiving the difference between objects). The key notion in Gestalt is the belief that “an impression was a synthesized whole and was more than the sum of its parts” (Davis & Lenon, 1988, p. 176). In relation to dress and clothing, the overall impression of a clothed individual would not

be formed by analyzing each and every item of clothing worn by that individual, but should be considered as a composite whole, in which each item is interdependent (on both other clothing items and physical characteristics, and well as other external factors such as environment and situation) and the meanings of the attire as a whole depends on how the perceiver organizes the physical cues and surrounding context (Damhorst, 1990, p.2).

The categorization process allows individuals to group people (as well as objects), or certain characteristics of the person, perceived as similar into one category and treats them as equivalent (McArthur, 1982). These categories allow for such inferences which can occur both consciously and unconsciously from categories that have been pre-formed by through previous experiences with other people or various forms of media depictions encountered during the span of one's life. People come to attach certain meanings to certain forms of dress and certain types of physical appearance. Tagiruri (1969, p.415) explains that "people infer the state or characteristics of other people because the circumstances, behavior or sequence of events are similar to those we have previously experienced."

The key contribution from Gestalt psychology as it relates to the current study, as noted by Davis & Lennon (1988), is that "an impression is a synthesized whole, and is different than the sum of its parts." When this is applied to clothing studies, to understand the full impression or image

portrayed by a particular dress, it is not enough to simply sum up the meanings of each individual clothing item, but should be seen as the whole ensemble.

There are three factors that have consistently affected person and social perception: (1) object or target variables (2) perceiver variables and (3) situational variables (Lennon & Davis, 1989).

Target Variables. Object or target variables are the specific characteristics of persons being observed. They are the specific actual and inferred characteristics of the person (i.e., the target individual) as perceived by the perceiver. They include the visual characteristics of the object, the salience of these characteristics, and the similarity and difference between these perceived characteristics and the self-perceptions of the perceiver. Both the salience of features and similarity to self are important because they both cause the perceiver to access certain categories in their cognitive schema, thus affecting overall impressions of the target person.

Object or target variables are important because they affect the way the target individuals are viewed by perceivers (Lennon & Davis, 1989). First impressions about a target individual are influenced by target variables such as their physical appearance and facial attractiveness (Nielsen & Kernaleguen, 1976). Features such as physical appearance and facial attractiveness are considered "visual cues" or nonverbal messages (Howlett,

Pine, Orak?io?lu & Fletcher, 2013) that perceivers use to make judgments about others. These visual cues can be further divided into "static" and "dynamic" cues. (Naumann, Vazire, Rentfrow & Gosling, 2009). Static cues are aspects of physical appearance that are manipulated by the target individual and usually relatively "fixed" compared to dynamic cues. Examples of static cues include, style of dress, hairstyle, use of accessories, body modification (e.g., tattoos). Meanwhile dynamic cues are related to nonverbal expressive behavior such as facial expressions or posture (Naumann, Vazire, Rentfrow & Gosling, 2009). In an attempt to analyze both static and dynamic cues, Nielsen and Kernaleguen (1976) examined physical appearance and facial attractiveness by utilizing two sets of photographs. The first set was comprised of a selection of facial images taken from a college yearbook, and the second set was comprised of clothed bodies from a fashion magazine with the faces omitted. The results showed that the judgments formed based on the facial photographs were significantly more varied than the judgments based on the clothed body photographs, due to the highly expressive nature of the face and expressions (Nielsen & Kernaleguen, 1976). Since dynamic cues change from situation to situation as well as possessing a highly expressive nature, dynamic cues escape the purpose of the current research and the focus for the current study will be on static cues, with an emphasis on clothing choice.

Clothing Variations. The typical procedure in clothing research has been to manipulate the clothing of the object/target individual and measuring the effects of clothing variations on subjects' first impressions about the object/target person's personality, behavioral characteristics, and ability related characteristics (Davis & Lennon, 1988). Such research has varied the style and/or type of clothing with the explicit intent to portray a specific image to the perceivers. Examples include Lewis and Johnson's (1989) study that manipulated the clothing of the target person to convey varying levels of perceived provocativeness; Workman and Johnson's (1989) study manipulated the clothing of the target person to convey different levels of perceived job appropriateness; and studies that have attempted to investigate perceptions of women's professional image by comparing target persons dressed in suits with target persons dressed in casual wear or dresses (e.g., Christman & Branson, 1990). Results of most studies uniformly support the conclusion that the clothing of the target person affects first impressions. However, as mentioned above, such studies artificially created "ideal" conditions in which clothing styles are fitted into specific categories. The current study aims to fill this gap by investigating the intended and unintended messages, or signals, in a real everyday naturalistic setting.

Perceiver Variables. While the different types and assortments of clothing have been shown to cause different impressions to be formed,

another important consideration is that certain characteristics of perceivers are also known to affect the way they make judgments about other people. According to person perception theory, the perceivers' physical traits, personal traits and cognitive structures are all said to make a contribution to the way that person forms impressions (Fiske & Taylor, 1991), as well as context of the situation in which judgments are made. Physical traits are aspects of the perceiver such as vision or hearing accuracy, personal traits are the goals, values, and personality and cognitive structures include memory and knowledge structures (Lennon & Davis, 1989). Therefore, personal differences of the perceiver must also be considered.

Fashion Consciousness. Fashion consciousness can be understood as the perceiver's personal level of clothing interest. The current study chose to utilize Kaiser's (1997) definition of fashion consciousness in which it is defined as "the extent to which an individual is favorably predisposed to clothes" (Kaiser, 1997, pg. 295). This can include the amount of time, money and attention spent on clothing (Kaiser, 1997). Kaiser (1997) states that people who spend a relatively significant amount of time, money, and energy on seeking information on clothing and personal grooming are likely to have a high degree of clothing interest. Bell (1991) also states that an individual with high fashion consciousness is more likely to judge others on the basis of clothing.

As noted by Paek (1986) while reviewing clothing literature, findings have indicated that there is an important interaction between a person's personality and his or her preferences towards a specific style of dress and/or clothing item (Paek, 1986). For example, Bell (1991) noted that the perceiver's level of interest in clothing influenced the evaluations of others' clothing, making fashion interest an important aspect for both the perceiver as well as the target individual. Fashion interest can be considered a personality trait in that it quantifies the degree to which the perceiver values clothing, but also a cognitive structure because it requires knowledge of clothing related concepts (i.e., fashion trends, brands and brand specific images, etc.).

Fashion consciousness is an adequate tool to measure the level of fashion interest. As defined by Nam. et. al., (2007) fashion consciousness is "a person's degree of involvement with the styles of fashion products." Also, past literature refer to fashion conscious consumers as "those individuals who are characterized by a deeper interest in fashion brands and products as well as in their physical appearance (Gutman & Mills, 1982)." The scale specifically measures the extent to which a consumer focuses, or perceives the self to be focused on, having up-to-date styles as it pertains to clothing, it is therefore a suitable measure for the importance the individual places on clothing and physical appearance. The concept of fashion consciousness is therefore used in the current study as an inclusive measure for level of

fashion involvement.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory is a social psychological theory which attempts to explain the role of self-conception in group membership, group processes, and intergroup relations. (Contemporary Social Psychological Theories, pg. 111, Peter James Burke). Social identity as defined by Tajfel is the "individual's knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of this group membership" (Tajfel 1972, 292). This notion that social identity includes cognitive, evaluative and affective components is supported by recent research (e.g., Roccas et al., 2008) and allows for further studies of both intergroup and intragroup comparisons.

As noted by Kwon (1987), people's clothing choices often depend on the kind of person the individual is and the groups to which the individual belongs to. This notion is closely related to social identity theory, which explains how the self-perception of group membership, group processes, and intergroup relations influence behavior. Social identity theory may provide useful insights into clothing and sports research in that people tend to clothes themselves to acknowledge being part of a group (Satrapa et al., 1992) and this behavior stems from the fact that clothes provide a communication medium through which the unique traits of an individual, as

well as the qualities that tie that individual to other members of society via the use of shared fashion norms, culture or social patterns, are signaled to both the self and others (Kwon, 1987). In other words, people use clothing not only to define and communicate their group identity or social identity to others (Feinberg, Mataro & Burroughs, 1992), but also as a symbol of their connection to others.

The original social identity theory along with the subsequent development of self-categorization theory were heavily focused on the underlying cognitive process of categorization and sources of distinctiveness. This approach was sufficient for explaining why and how social categorization and in-group and out-group distinctions become salient. However, it did not explain the underlying motivations for such behavior, especially for long term identification with particular in-groups. The only motivational aspect was that social identity salience had motivational aspect in that individuals strive for positive distinctiveness. Therefore, Leonardelli et al. (2010) suggested the use of optimal distinctiveness theory to fill the gap present in social identity theory.

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory. Optimal distinctiveness theory argues that there are two fundamental motivations for seeking social identification which are : (1) the need for assimilation and (2) the need for differentiation. Brewer (1991, 1993; Brewer & Pickett, 1999) stated the

need for assimilation and need for differentiation are in opposition, and an individual can be placed along a continuum with complete uniqueness at one end and total assimilation at the other. Thus a key implication of optimal distinctiveness theory is that an individual will tend to seek differentiation when their group has high levels of inclusiveness (i.e., a group with a large number of members), while when a group offers too much individuation, members will tend to seek sources for belongingness or assimilation. The key notion is that individuals seek a "balance" between such assimilation and differentiation needs and thus the salience of social identification will be strongest for the groups that offer opportunities for both assimilation and distinctiveness (Badea et al. 2010; Hornsey and Hogg 1999).

Need to Belong. As mentioned above, people have a fundamental need for assimilation and is often portrayed by conforming to the behaviors and/or expectations of others (Asch 1955; Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel 1989). In this sense, being similar to others supports the human need for validation (Brewer 1991; Snyder and Fromkin 1980). The need for assimilation is not only portrayed through conformity to groups in which the individual is a member of, but also by conforming to groups to which the individual aspires to be a member of (Englis & Solomon, 1995). They make choices that are consistent with positively perceived reference groups in order to construct, develop or express their desired identities (Berger and

Heath 2007, 2008; Escalas and Bettman 2003, 2005). For example, if participating in figure skating is associated with an artistic image, then people who want to seem artistic may aspire to express this identity through participation in figure skating, or dressing in the manner that is typically tied to figure skaters. Another example may be that if playing American football is tied to a tough image, then people who want to seem tough or masculine, may choose to dress as a football fan.

Need for Uniqueness. Contrary to the need to belong, there exists a need for differentiation (Maslach 1974; Snyder and Fromkin 1980; Vignoles, Chrysoschoou, and Breakwell 2000). Most people have a desire to be “their own self” or unique to some degree (Lynn and Snyder 2002) and being too similar to others can generate a negative emotional reaction (Snyder and Fromkin 1980). Individuals with relatively higher needs for uniqueness tend to prefer products that are more scarce or differentiated as compared to the norms of a particular reference group (Lynn and Harris 1997; Tian et al. 2001). This need can be activated through a variety of factors. For example, situational factors can activate desires to make different consumption choices or distinguish themselves from those around them through various behaviors (Ariely and Levav 2000; Fischbach, Ratner, and Zhang 2011; Maimaran and Wheeler 2008). For example, differentiation may be sought by consuming products that diverge from out-group members to avoid

portraying undesired identities (Berger and Heath 2007; Berger and Rand 2008; White and Dahl 2006), or acting in a different manner in a given situation.

Self-identity and Athletic Identity

Individuals are also known to use clothing to construct and retain their own sense of personal identity (Howlett, Pine, Orakcioglu & Fletcher, 2013). Although people may use clothing to portray their social identity to others, they also tend to identify with their clothing, and in some cases clothing is viewed as an extension of a person's inner self. Feinberg, Mataro and Burroghs (1992) found that the cues of social identity could only be interpreted with any accuracy if the individual specifically selected it to be a true representation of the person's self-perceived self identity. In relation to the current study, it was postulated that the level of athletic identity of sports club participants will be especially salient on days of sports participation.

Athletic identity has been defined as "the strength and exclusivity to which a person identifies with the athletic role (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993). Athletic identity in research has been shown to significantly influence a variety of topics such as academic performance, identity foreclosure, health habits, food preferences, consumption behavior, mood disturbance, sport performance, drug usage vulnerability, transitions in and out of sports and gender roles (Cieslak, 2004). Given that clothing is closely

associated with self-identity, and the development of self-identity is “inseparable from the parallel development of collective social identity and is continuously validated through social interaction” (Jenkins, 1996), it can be predicted that when athletic identity is situationally salient, portrayals of the identity will be noticeable in behavior and possibly clothing choice.

Human Brand Personality

Although several scholars have attempted to define the term “human brand” or “athlete brand”, the discussion is still in progress and there has not yet been a common consensus as to the definition. However, a brand in the sports context is defined as “a name, design, symbol or any combination that a sports organization uses to help differentiate its product from the competitions” (Shank, 1999, p. 239). In this sense any athlete can be a brand because they satisfy the criteria of having a name, distinctive looks, and their own personality (Arai, Ko, & Ross, 2014). The most widely used definition of a human brand is “any well-known persona who is the subject of marketing communications efforts” (Thomson, 2006). Many companies or brands form relationships with celebrities and athletes with the expectation that the positive persona on the athlete will transfer to the brand. This transfer of attributes can be viewed as a form of identification, which is an overlap between the consumer's schema and the endorser's schema (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000). Research suggests that the attraction

and subsequent identification to these endorsers may be a result of a brand personality (Aaker, 1997; Carlson, Donovan, & Cumiskey, 2009). Aaker (1997) described brand personality as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand.” However, as noted by Carlson and Donovan (2013) this definition may be too broad to apply to athletes or individuals because it is inclusive of almost everything related to human beings and is applied directly to brands without regarding how it may be relevant to “brands.”

The application of brand personality to athletes requires a distinction between the two concepts. This can be achieved by differentiating personality traits and states. Past research on human personality focuses on innate traits of individuals (Fridhandler, 1986) which are described as the “Big Five” : extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Personality traits are characterized as being stable, internal, and long lasting (Chaplin, John, & Goldberg, 1988).

Meanwhile, personality states are temporary in nature and usually caused by external circumstances (Chaplin, John, & Goldberg, 1988). Although human brand personality and brand personality have similarities, there are also innate differences present (Aaker, 1997; Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Guido, 2001; Lee & Cho, 2009). To further explain, athletes obviously have unique personality traits which can be both positively or negatively perceived, the ability to influence others is dependent on the individual's

ability to construct and communicate a desirable human brand personality (i.e., state). These states are communicated to others through observable mediums such as media depiction, product associations and group associations.

To illustrate the difference between traits and brands, we can look at the example of Tiger Woods. Although it is impossible to know actual Big Five personality traits of Tiger Wood, prior to the marital infidelity scandal of 2009, through media depictions, based on Aaker's (1997) personality dimension's, was generally viewed as wholesome and sincere. However, post-scandal, the brand personality shifted in the perception of most viewers. Therefore, unless there is human face-to-face interaction, and usually a long history between people, it is almost impossible to know the innate traits of a person, but states can be more readily observable through simple observation. Extending this line of thought, it can be assumed that not only can celebrities and famous athletes be viewed as brands, but also the average Joe/Jane. Looking back to the definition of a brand by Shank (1999), the factors that constitute a brand were a name, design, symbol, and marketing communications. This can also apply to not only famous personas, but also the average individual. Only when defining "human brand" is the notion of 'familiarity' or 'fame' include. However, with the advent of the internet and continued advancements in telecommunications, there are numerous outlets (such as social networking sites) readily available to each

and every individual. Therefore, even the average person can be regarded as taking part in the constant process of building a human brand and constantly updating their desired image. Therefore to fulfill the purpose of the study, it was decided the application of human brand personality to non-celebrities/athletes would be reasonable.

Research Questions

1. Are there differences in the first impression judgments about the need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, fashion consciousness and personality traits of sports club members between the clothing categories of active sportswear, casual sportswear and on-sportswear?
2. Are the first impression judgments made by observers similar or different from the self-perceptions of the sports club members?
3. Are there differences in the first impression judgments about the need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, fashion consciousness and personality traits of sports club members between the different types of sport clubs of basketball, baseball, soccer and weightlifting?

Method

Due to the nature of the study, participants were divided into two groups, target participants and observer participants. Therefore the procedure and participant composition are different for each group.

Participants

Target Participants. Target participants were students who are members of the four types of target sports clubs (soccer, baseball, basketball, training) at universities across Korea. A total of 115 target participants were recruited from 6 universities located in Seoul and surrounding metropolitan areas. The specific sports clubs targeted were soccer(football), basketball, training (including running, weightlifting, bodybuilding, crossfit, pilates, yoga, etc.), and baseball from each university.

The choice of sports was made by considering two factors, the popularity of the sport, and whether well-known sports brands had specific production categories for the sports. According to the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism's "2016 Survey of Citizens' Sports Participation," the most frequently joined sports clubs for the target age group (20s) were soccer, basketball, badminton, bodybuilding, and swimming. Although badminton and swimming was ranked high as a participant sport in Korea, most popular sports brands did not have a specific line of production for the two sports, therefore they were omitted. As for bodybuilding, considering

that the popular sports brands all include a line of production for some form of training & gym activities (including running/jogging, workout, yoga, crossfit, etc.), they were included under the title 'training'. Finally, considering the overwhelming popularity of professional baseball in the Korean spectator sport market, we decided to include it in the study. Therefore, the final sports clubs to be studied are soccer, basketball, baseball, and training.

Observer Participants. Observer participants were male and female university students including the same universities as the target participants through random sampling. The rationale for selected observer participants from the same universities, rather than from completely different universities, is to later test if there are significant differences between judgments made by same university students and other university students. Also, a small portion of the target participants will also be included as observer participants, as well as new recruits that participate in other sports clubs of the same sports of interest.

Procedure

Target Participants' Procedure. The target participants were recruited by visiting several universities' athletic clubs. A total of 115 target participants were recruited, but after removing photos with school signage

or logos, a 90 target participants were used for the study from the four types of sports clubs (soccer, baseball, basketball, training). Each recruit was given a verbal consent form addressing the purpose, activities involved in the study, potential risks, benefits, and notice that states the participation is completely voluntary.

Upon consent, photos of each student was taken for use as the visual clothing cues. All photos were taken with a Samsung Galaxy Note 5 smart phone camera and the distance from the camera, resolution of the photos, and preferred lighting conditions were are controlled. All target participants were photographed using a standardized posture with head looking straight at the camera, feet shoulders width apart and hands relaxed to the sides, minimizing the effects of posture related cues.

Next, the target participants were asked to complete a survey about their social groups, personal characteristics, and demographic information to use as the self-perception that the wearers have of themselves.

To remove the effects of facial features and environmental cues, each picture was retouched to blur out the faces and background (i.e., only their clothes, footwear and body are shown). Also, photos were adjusted for brightness and size/ratio to provide pictures with equal tones and visibility. The retouched photos were then be categorized into three groups by utilizing an expert panel method, which is often used when specialized input and opinions are required for an evaluation. The categories were (1) active

sportswear, (2) casual sportswear, and (3) non-sportswear, following the categorization by Han (2009). For accuracy of categorization, the expert panel consisted of, sports management experts, fashion experts, fabrics experts, sportswear experts, as well as researchers in the fields of fashion and sports management.



Figure 1. Sample Images of Target Participants

Observer Participants' Procedure. Surveys for the respondents were conducted via pen and paper survey. Respondents were asked if they would voluntarily participate in the survey, and if not, they were asked to end the survey. Upon consent, data about the respondents' personally important social groups, athletic identity, and fashion consciousness were collected.

Next, each respondent was shown a total of three random photos from one of the clothing categories (active sportswear, street sportswear &

sport look, non-sportswear). For each respondent, the first photo the first photo was shown, after which they were asked to fill out the survey asking to make first impression judgments about the person. First impression judgments were made about the social groups, conformity and distinctiveness (need for belongingness and need for uniqueness), fashion consciousness, and human brand personality traits. After completion, the same process was repeated for the second and third photos. Finally, demographic data including age, gender, and economic status were collected.

Instrumentation

The questionnaires for both target and observer participants included items to measure:

- 1) Demographic Data (Age, Gender, Geography, Economic Status)
- 2) Social Groups
- 3) Need to Belong
- 4) Consumers' Need for Uniqueness
- 5) Athletic Identity
- 6) Fashion Consciousness
- 7) Human Brand Personality

Demographic Information. Basic demographic data consisting of age, gender, major, home town, and economic status was collected.

Social Groups. Based on prior work by Escalas and Bettman (2005) and Chan, Berger, and Van Boven (2012), both target and observer participants were asked a modified version of the question to identify several in-groups in order of personal importance using the instructions below.

"We would like you to write in the name of five(5) small, tightly knit social groups that you belong to and feel a part of within the college campus or university setting. You should feel you are this type of person and that you fit in with these people. This group should be quite specific."

Need to Belong. The 'need to belong scale' by Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, (2013) was used to measure target participants' need for belongingness. Although there are several versions of the need to belong scale, the 2012 version is recent and empirically sound of the current measures. The scale will be measured on a five point Likert scale.

Table 1

Need to Belong Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
Need to Belong	1) If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me.
	2) I try hard not to do things that will make other people avoid or reject me.
	3) I seldom worry about whether other people care about me.
	4) I need to feel that there are people I can turn to in times of need.
	5) I want other people to accept me.
	6) I do not like being alone.
	7) Being apart from my friends for long periods of time does not bother me.
	8) I have a strong need to belong.
	9) It bothers me a great deal when I am not included in other people's plans.
	10) My feelings are easily hurt when I feel that others do not accept me.

Consumers' Need for Uniqueness. The short form scale of consumers' need for uniqueness scale by Ruvio, Shoham, Brencic (2008) will be used to measure the need for uniqueness of target participants.

Table 2

Consumers' Need for Uniqueness Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
Consumers'	1) I often combine possessions in such a way that I create a personal image that cannot be duplicated.

Need for Uniqueness	2) I often try to find a more interesting version of run-of-the-mill products because I enjoy being original.
	3) I actively seek to develop my personal uniqueness by buying special products or brands.
	4) Having an eye for products that are interesting and unusual assists me in establishing a distinctive image.
	5) When it comes to the products I buy and the situations in which I use them, I have broken customs and rules.
	6) I have often violated the understood rules of my social group regarding what to buy or own.
	7) I have often gone against the understood rules of my social group regarding when and how certain products are properly used.
	8) I enjoy challenging the prevailing taste of people I know by buying something they would not seem to accept.
	9) When a product I own becomes popular among the general population, I begin to use it less.
	10) I often try to avoid products or brands that I know are bought by the general populations
	11) As a rule, I dislike products or brands that are customarily bought by everyone.
	12) The more commonplace a product or brand is among the general population, the less interested I am in buying it.

Athletic Identity. The 10-item, Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS) by Brewer et al. (1993) was used for both target and observer participants. The scale is measured on a 5-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Table 3

Athletic Identity Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
Athletic	1) I consider myself an athlete.

- Identity
- 2) I have many goal related to sport.
 - 3) Most of my friends are athletes.
 - 4) Sport is the most important part of my life.
 - 5) I spend more time thinking about sport than anything else.
 - 6) I need to participate in sports to feel good about myself.
 - 7) Other people see me mainly as an athlete.
 - 8) I feel bad about myself when I do poorly in sport.
 - 9) Sport is the only important thing in my life.
 - 10) I would be very depressed if I were injured an could not compete in sport.
-

Fashion Consciousness. Shim and Gehrt's (1996) scale was utilized to measure the fashion consciousness of both target and observer participants.

Table 4

Fashion Consciousness Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
Athletic Identity	1) I consider myself an athlete.
	2) I have many goal related to sport.
	3) Most of my friends are athletes.
	4) Sport is the most important part of my life.
	5) I spend more time thinking about sport than anything else.
	6) I need to participate in sports to feel good about myself.
	7) Other people see me mainly as an athlete.
	8) I feel bad about myself when I do poorly in sport.

9) Sport is the only important thing in my life.

10) I would be very depressed if I were injured and could not compete in sport.

Human Brand Personality. A modified version of Carlson and Donovan's (2013) Athlete Brand Personality Scale was utilized to measure both self-judgments of target participants as well as first impression judgments by observer participants.

Table 5

Human Brand Personality Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
Please take a moment to think of how you perceive (____) and indicate to what extent each of the following words describe him.	
Human Brand Personality Traits	1) Wholesome
	2) Imaginative
	3) Successful
	4) Charming
	5) Tough

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Participants. A total of 115 photos of target participants were collected from 6 universities located in Seoul and surrounding metropolitan areas. Of the 115 photos, after removing photos for inadequate poses, lighting problems, and cases in which the target was holding items in their hands, 90 were selected for final use as stimuli for the current research. 66 (73.3%) of the target participants were male, and 24 (26.7%) were female. Since the target participants were sports club members of each university, they all were within the age range of 19-28. In terms of clothing category, 31 (34.4%) target participants were categorized as active sportswear wearers, 29 (32.2%) as casual sportswear wearers, and 30 (33.3%) as non-sportswear wearers. In terms of sports club type, 35 (38.9%) were members of basketball clubs, 17 (18.9%) were from baseball clubs, 23 (25.6%) from soccer clubs, and 15 (16.7%) from weightlifting clubs.

Meanwhile, a total of 444 surveys were distributed and after removing unusable responses, 429 surveys were used for final analysis. It should be noted that each survey contained 3 photos of different target participants, and in some cases respondents completed only a portion of the 3 total impression surveys, and even incomplete surveys were utilized in analysis (under the condition that the survey completed at least 2 of the 3

impression judgments, and completed the section about their own self-perceptions and sociodemographic information). The gender of the observer participants consisted of 202 (47.1%) male, and 227 (52.9%) female respondents. The age range was primarily between the ages of 20-39 (94.7%). These observer participants generated a total number of 954 first impression judgments. Detailed demographic information can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

Demographics of Study Participants

Participant Type	Variable	Category	N	%
Target Participants	Gender	Male	66	73.3
		Female	24	26.7
	Age	19 and Under	1	1.1
		20~29	89	98.9
	Clothing Category	Active Sportswear	31	34.4
		Casual Sportswear	29	32.2
		Non-sportswear	30	33.3
Subtotal			90	100.0
Observer Participants	Gender	Male	202	47.1
		Female	227	52.9
	Age	19 and Under	15	3.5
		20~29	280	65.5

	30~39	125	29.2
	40 and Above	9	1.8
Subtotal		429	100.0
Total		519	

Descriptive Statistics. The statistical package SPSS 21.0 was used to analyze the scale items' reliability of the variables need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, and fashion consciousness. Single item measures were utilized for the human brand personality trait items of wholesomeness, imaginativeness, successfulness, charmingness and toughness. Reliability of a scale is concerned with whether or not a scale can consistently reflect the construct it is meant to measure. The current study utilized the Cronbach's alpha method, which is the general method used for reliability tests. The variables of need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, and fashion consciousness all reported Cronbach's alpha values exceeded the threshold value of 0.70, therefore confirming the reliability of those scales.

As for the use of single item indicators (human brand personality traits of wholesome, imaginative, successful, charming, and tough) has been recommended in certain cases for simplicity and ease of use, as well as increased flexibility and face validity (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Kwon & Trail, 2005). In the case of the current study, brand personality dimensions were originally developed to apply to tangible brands, however

a sports team or athlete is not really tangible and can be considered a quasi-brand therefore traditional measures may not directly apply (Carlson, Donavan, & Cumiskey, 2009). Also, given that the average completion time of the surveys were quite lengthy compared to most, single item measures were deemed the most appropriate to minimize respondent fatigue.

Table 7

Summary of Key Variables

Variable	Item #	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Need to Belong	1	1	5	3.27	1.09
	2	1	5	3.34	1.01
	3	1	5	3.06	1.15
	4	1	5	3.22	1.09
	5	1	5	3.47	1.01
	6	1	5	3.06	1.04
	7	1	5	3.38	1.08
	8	1	5	3.07	1.12
	9	1	5	3.11	1.07
	10	1	5	3.02	1.11
Need for Uniqueness	1	1	5	2.83	1.18
	2	1	5	2.80	1.17
	3	1	5	2.88	1.08
	4	1	5	2.56	1.07
	5	1	5	2.48	1.07
	6	1	5	2.60	1.12

	7	1	5	2.53	1.02
	8	1	5	2.79	1.15
	9	1	5	2.73	1.16
	10	1	5	2.691	1.00
	11	1	5	2.52	1.11
	12	1	5	2.46	1.07
Athletic Identity	1	1	5	3.41	1.24
	2	1	5	3.20	1.27
	3	1	5	3.19	1.21
	4	1	5	3.10	1.34
	5	1	5	2.99	1.27
	6	1	5	2.90	1.26
	7	1	5	3.42	1.18
	8	1	5	3.09	1.24
	9	1	5	2.98	1.30
	10	1	5	2.68	1.29
Fashion Consciousness	1	1	5	3.02	1.23
	2	1	5	3.08	1.22
	3	1	5	2.80	1.16
	4	1	5	2.90	1.24
Wholesome	1	1	5	3.57	1.00
Imaginative	1	1	5	2.95	1.16
Successful	1	1	5	3.02	1.00
Charming	1	1	5	3.10	1.11
Tough	1	1	5	2.70	1.23

Table 8

Cronbach's α Reliability Test Results

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's α
Need to Belong	10	0.889
Need for Uniqueness	12	0.915
Athletic Identity	10	0.950
Fashion Consciousness	4	0.896
Wholesome	1	-
Imaginative	1	-
Successful	1	-
Charming	1	-
Tough	1	-

Comparison of First Impressions between Clothing Categories

The first research question of the current study was to analyze whether or not there were differences in the first impressions formed by observers between the sportswear categories in all variables. To do so, a series of analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted with each sportswear category being the independent variable, while need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, fashion consciousness and human brand personality traits were used as independent variables.

However, for an ANOVA analysis to be considered reliable, the data must meet three basic assumptions of independence, normal distribution, and homogeneous variation (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Therefore, the survey data was first evaluated to determine if these

assumptions were met.

First, the three groups of active sportswear, casual sportswear, and non-sportswear were mutually exclusive groups. In other words, none of the target participants could have simultaneously been classified as both active and casual sportswear.

Second, the data was analyzed to check for normal distribution. The values for skewness and kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable in order to prove normal normality of data (George & Mallery, 2010). All the variables for each clothing category fell between this range, therefore being deemed acceptable as shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Skewness and Kurtosis Analysis by Clothing Category

Clothing Category	Variable	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Active Sportswear	Need to Belong	-0.346	0.134	0.194	0.267
	Need for Uniqueness	0.325	0.134	-0.493	0.267
	Athletic Identity	-0.495	0.134	0.117	0.267
	Fashion Consciousness	0.13	0.134	-0.876	0.267
	Wholesome	-0.329	0.134	-0.53	0.267
	Imaginative	0.299	0.134	-0.455	0.267
	Successful	-0.092	0.134	-0.392	0.267
	Charming	-0.092	0.134	-0.803	0.267
	Tough	-0.123	0.134	-1.035	0.267
Casual Sportswear	Need to Belong	-0.269	0.138	-0.344	0.275
	Need for Uniqueness	0.227	0.138	-0.488	0.275
	Athletic Identity	-0.035	0.138	-0.945	0.275

	Fashion Consciousness	0.388	0.138	-0.615	0.275
	Wholesome	-0.468	0.138	-0.08	0.275
	Imaginative	0.312	0.138	-0.361	0.275
	Successful	-0.104	0.138	-0.417	0.275
	Charming	0.172	0.138	-0.642	0.275
	Tough	0.297	0.138	-0.892	0.275
Non Sportswear	Need to Belong	-0.297	0.138	-0.391	0.276
	Need for Uniqueness	0.059	0.138	-0.361	0.276
	Athletic Identity	0.328	0.138	-0.857	0.276
	Fashion Consciousness	-0.057	0.138	-0.794	0.276
	Wholesome	-0.177	0.138	-0.573	0.276
	Imaginative	0.125	0.138	-0.729	0.276
	Successful	0.1	0.138	-0.114	0.276
	Charming	0.009	0.138	-0.851	0.276
	Tough	0.499	0.138	-0.737	0.276

Since skewness as kurtosis levels are only arbitrary methods of determining normality, and the number of observations was significantly less than the threshold of 2,000 suggested by Park (2008), a Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality was also conducted to further investigate the validity of using parametric statistical methods. .

Table 11

Results of Shapiro-Wilk's Test of Normality

Variable	Clothing Category	Shapiro-Wilk's Test		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Need to Belong	Active Sportswear	0.986	332	0.003
	Casual Sportswear	0.987	312	0.008
	Non Sportswear	0.986	310	0.005
Need for Uniqueness	Active Sportswear	0.979	332	0.000

	Casual Sportswear	0.985	312	0.002
	Non Sportswear	0.991	310	0.055
Athletic Identity	Active Sportswear	0.977	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.975	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.961	310	0.000
Fashion Consciousness	Active Sportswear	0.964	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.961	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.972	310	0.000
Wholesome	Active Sportswear	0.898	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.881	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.901	310	0.000
Imaginative	Active Sportswear	0.907	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.896	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.910	310	0.000
Successful	Active Sportswear	0.909	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.883	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.896	310	0.000
Charming	Active Sportswear	0.910	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.899	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.910	310	0.000
Tough	Active Sportswear	0.907	332	0.000
	Casual Sportswear	0.894	312	0.000
	Non Sportswear	0.879	310	0.000

Results of the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality showed that all variables in all clothing categories (with the exception of need for uniqueness in the non-sportswear category) showed to be significant, therefore stating that all variables were not normally distributed. However, given that the Shapiro-Wilk test is considered quite conservative when sample sizes are larger than 100~200, and the central limit theorem stating that samples from a population with finite variance will approach a normal

distribution regardless of the distribution of the population, it was considered reasonable to carry out parametric evaluations. Nevertheless, ANOVA results were examined carefully, and double checked with the Welch and Brown-Forsythe methods.

Also, ANOVA tests assume that the variance of the groups being compared are homogeneous. Therefore, the Levene test for equality of variance was used.

Table 12

Levene's Test for Equality of Variance

Variable	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Need to Belong	0.523	2	951	0.593
Need for Uniqueness	4.179	2	951	0.016
Athletic Identity	12.667	2	951	0.000
Fashion Consciousness	2.763	2	951	0.064
Wholesome	2.288	2	951	0.102
Imaginative	1.527	2	951	0.218
Successful	0.114	2	951	0.892
Charming	1.713	2	951	0.181
Tough	0.178	2	951	0.837

Results of the Levene's test showed that at the 0.05 level, the variables of need for uniqueness, and athletic identity did not exhibit homogeneity of variance. The Welch and the Brown-Forsythe tests are considered robust tests when comparing means, especially for when the

assumption of homogeneity is violated (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Also, the Kruskal-Wallis H Test is a non-parametric test that is used when the homogeneity of variance assumption is not met. Therefore, the four tests of ANOVA, Welch, Brown-Forsythe, and Kruskal-Wallis H Test were all used in the analysis of results.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted as well as Tukey post-hoc tests to compare the effect of clothing categories (active, casual and non sportswear) on the dependent variables of need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, fashion consciousness, and the five human brand personality variables (wholesome, imaginative, successful, charming, tough). The results showed that the effect of clothing category on all variables except wholesome were statistically significant. Results of the ANOVA tests are show in Table 9, along with the Welch and Brown-Forsythe test and Kruskal-Wallis tests in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13

One-way ANOVA Results

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Need to Belong	Between Groups	418.197	2	209.099	3.710	0.025
	Within Groups	53592.626	951	56.354		
	Total	54010.823	953			
Need for Uniqueness	Between Groups	1338.503	2	669.251	7.528	0.001
	Within Groups	84549.271	951	88.906		
	Total	85887.774	953			

Athletic Identity	Between Groups	15439.266	2	7719.633		
	Within Groups	84462.14	951	88.814	86.919	0.000
	Total	99901.406	953			
Fashion Consciousness	Between Groups	675.873	2	337.937		
	Within Groups	16608.99	951	17.465	19.350	0.000
	Total	17284.864	953			
Wholesome	Between Groups	3.477	2	1.739		
	Within Groups	913.627	951	0.961	1.810	0.164
	Total	917.104	953			
Imaginative	Between Groups	11.056	2	5.528		
	Within Groups	1032.538	951	1.086	5.092	0.006
	Total	1043.594	953			
Successful	Between Groups	18.452	2	9.226		
	Within Groups	853.881	951	0.898	10.275	0.000
	Total	872.332	953			
Charming	Between Groups	15.559	2	7.780		
	Within Groups	1086.625	951	1.143	6.809	0.001
	Total	1102.184	953			
Tough	Between Groups	78.718	2	39.359		
	Within Groups	1399.518	951	1.472	26.745	0.000
	Total	1478.236	953			

Table 14

Post-hoc Test Results

Variable	Clothing Category		Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
	(I)	(J)		
Need to Belong	ASW	CSW	1.55	0.024
		NSW	0.36	0.817
	CSW	ASW	-1.55	0.024
		NSW	-1.19	0.118
	NSW	ASW	-0.36	0.817
		CSW	1.19	0.118
Need for Uniqueness	ASW	CSW	2.26	0.007
		NSW	-0.48	0.793

	CSW	ASW	-2.26	0.007
		NSW	-2.74	0.001
	NSW	ASW	0.48	0.793
		CSW	2.74	0.001
Athletic Identity	ASW	CSW	6.16	0.000
		NSW	9.66	0.000
	CSW	ASW	-6.16	0.000
		NSW	3.51	0.000
	NSW	ASW	-9.66	0.000
		CSW	-3.51	0.000
Fashion Consciousness	ASW	CSW	1.20	0.001
		NSW	-0.88	0.022
	CSW	ASW	-1.20	0.001
		NSW	-2.08	0.000
	NSW	ASW	0.88	0.022
		CSW	2.08	0.000
Wholesome	ASW	CSW	0.06	0.725
		NSW	0.15	0.141
	CSW	ASW	-0.06	0.725
		NSW	0.09	0.505
	NSW	ASW	-0.15	0.141
		CSW	-0.09	0.505
Imaginative	ASW	CSW	0.19	0.061
		NSW	-0.07	0.660
	CSW	ASW	-0.19	0.061
		NSW	-0.26	0.006
	NSW	ASW	0.07	0.660
		CSW	0.26	0.006
Successful	ASW	CSW	0.33	0.000
		NSW	0.23	0.007
	CSW	ASW	-0.33	0.000
		NSW	-0.10	0.380

	NSW	ASW	-0.23	0.007
		CSW	0.10	0.380
Charming	ASW	CSW	0.31	0.001
		NSW	0.11	0.417
	CSW	ASW	-0.31	0.001
		NSW	-0.20	0.051
	NSW	ASW	-0.11	0.417
		CSW	0.20	0.051
Tough	ASW	CSW	0.54	0.000
		NSW	0.65	0.000
	CSW	ASW	-0.54	0.000
		NSW	0.11	0.520
	NSW	ASW	-0.65	0.000
		CSW	-0.11	0.520

Table 15

Kruskal-Wallis Test of Equality of Medians

Variable	Clothing Category	N	Mean Rank
Need to Belong	Active Sportswear	332	498.92
	Casual Sportswear	312	444.60
	Non Sportswear	310	487.68
Need for Uniqueness	Active Sportswear	332	488.00
	Casual Sportswear	312	431.52
	Non Sportswear	310	512.53
Athletic Identity	Active Sportswear	332	615.67
	Casual Sportswear	312	450.12
	Non Sportswear	310	357.07
Fashion Consciousness	Active Sportswear	332	484.32
	Casual Sportswear	312	407.21
	Non Sportswear	310	540.94

Wholesome	Active Sportswear	332	496.11
	Casual Sportswear	312	480.46
	Non Sportswear	310	454.59
Imaginative	Active Sportswear	332	485.36
	Casual Sportswear	312	441.39
	Non Sportswear	310	505.42
Successful	Active Sportswear	332	526.90
	Casual Sportswear	312	439.08
	Non Sportswear	310	463.25
Charming	Active Sportswear	332	511.31
	Casual Sportswear	312	434.38
	Non Sportswear	310	484.69
Tough	Active Sportswear	332	559.96
	Casual Sportswear	312	446.28
	Non Sportswear	310	420.61

Table 16

Welch and Brown-Forsythe Robust Tests of Equality of Means

Variable	Test Type	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Need to Belong	Welch	3.668	2	632.065	0.026
	Brown-Forsythe	3.708	2	947.096	0.025
Need for Uniqueness	Welch	8.087	2	633.834	0.000
	Brown-Forsythe	7.564	2	947.333	0.001
Athletic Identity	Welch	94.192	2	623.462	0.000
	Brown-Forsythe	86.317	2	917.263	0.000
Fashion Consciousness	Welch	20.340	2	632.840	0.000
	Brown-Forsythe	19.395	2	946.238	0.000
Wholesome	Welch	1.735	2	633.286	0.177
	Brown-Forsythe	1.815	2	948.218	0.163
Imaginative	Welch	5.353	2	632.531	0.005
	Brown-Forsythe	5.099	2	945.520	0.006
Successful	Welch	9.884	2	633.302	0.000

	Brown-Forsythe	10.331	2	943.655	0.000
Charming	Welch	7.279	2	631.739	0.001
	Brown-Forsythe	6.817	2	941.104	0.001
Tough	Welch	25.565	2	633.671	0.000
	Brown-Forsythe	26.824	2	949.906	0.000

Results of all tests were similar in terms of significance level, therefore it was determined that the ANOVA results were confirmed by the additional tests and could be interpreted as is.

Need to belong results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=3.71$ and significance level of $p=0.025$. Need for uniqueness produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=7.53$ and significance level of $p=0.001$. Athletic identity results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=86.92$ and significance level of $p<0.001$. Fashion consciousness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=19.35$ and significance level of $p<0.001$. Wholesomeness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=1.81$ and significance level of $p=0.164$. Imaginativeness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=5.09$ and significance level of $p=0.006$. Successfulness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=10.28$ and significance level of $p<0.001$. Charmingness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=6.81$ and significance level of $p=0.001$. And finally, toughness results produced a critical value of $F(2, 951)=26.75$ and significance level of $p<0.001$. Preliminary ANOVA results indicate that the first impressions for the 'wholesome' variable did not differ among clothing categories, but all other impressions had statistically

significant differences.

To identify specific differences between the first impressions of each clothing category, a series of Tukey post-hoc tests were conducted. Results can be seen below in Table 8. The results for the post-hoc test allowed the following conclusions to be drawn:

- a) Active sportswear wearers were judged as having a higher need to belong than casual sportswear wearers.
- b) Both active sportswear wearers and non-sportswear wearers were judged as having a higher need for uniqueness than casual sportswear wearers.
- c) For athletic identity first impressions, active sportswear wearers were judged to have the highest athletic identity, followed by casual sportswear wearers, and finally non-sportswear wearers.
- d) For fashion consciousness, non-sportswear wearers had the highest fashion consciousness, followed by active sportswear wearers, and finally casual sportswear wearers.
- e) There were no statistically significant differences in the first impression judgments regarding wholesomeness.
- f) Non-sportswear wearers were seen as being more imaginative than casual sportswear wearers.

- g) Active sportswear wearers were seen as being more successful than both casual and non-sportswear wearers.
- h) Active sportswear wearers seen as more charming than casual sportswear wearers.
- i) Active sportswear wearers seen as more tough than both casual and non-sportswear wearers.

Comparison between Self-perceptions and First Impressions

The second research question was to compare the self-perceptions of sports club members with the first-impression judgments made by observers and see for any similarities or differences between the two. To do so, the average of each first impression judgment was calculated for each target subject. Next, much like the ANOVA tests for research question 1, tests for normality of distribution and homogeneity of variance were tested for all variables. First, skewness and kurtosis levels were analyzed. Results showed that skewness and kurtosis levels fell within the -2 and 2 range (mostly inside the -1 and 1 range) indicating acceptable results. Results shown in Table 12.

Table 17

Skewness and Kurtosis Test Results

Category	Variable	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Self-Perceptions	Need to Belong	-0.417	0.254	0.817	0.503
	Need for Uniqueness	-0.221	0.254	0.403	0.503
	Athletic Identity	-0.692	0.254	0.037	0.503
	Fashion Consciousness	-0.417	0.254	0.375	0.503
	Wholesome	-0.416	0.254	-0.88	0.503
	Imaginative	-0.4	0.254	-0.926	0.503
	Successful	0.084	0.254	-0.707	0.503
	Charming	-0.108	0.254	-1.041	0.503
	Tough	-0.158	0.254	-0.232	0.503
First Impression Averages	Need to Belong	-0.234	0.254	-0.345	0.503
	Need for Uniqueness	0.689	0.254	1.005	0.503
	Athletic Identity	-0.125	0.254	-0.883	0.503
	Fashion Consciousness	0.024	0.254	0.006	0.503
	Wholesome	-0.69	0.254	0.744	0.503
	Imaginative	0.253	0.254	-0.211	0.503
	Successful	0.298	0.254	-0.38	0.503
	Charming	0.09	0.254	-0.625	0.503
	Tough	0.416	0.254	-0.234	0.503

Secondly, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality was conducted.

Results indicated that all variables for the impression averages were distributed normally with the exception of wholesomeness. However for self-perceptions, only the need to belong and need for uniqueness values were normally distributed (Table 13). Therefore in addition to the independent samples t-test, a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to confirm the results. The results of the t-test and Mann-Whitney

U test can be found in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 18

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality Results

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Need to Belong	Self-Perception	0.093	90	0.055
	Impression Average	0.055	90	0.200
Need for Uniqueness	Self-Perception	0.071	90	0.200
	Impression Average	0.067	90	0.200
Athletic Identity	Self-Perception	0.110	90	0.009
	Impression Average	0.075	90	0.200
Fashion Consciousness	Self-Perception	0.104	90	0.018
	Impression Average	0.066	90	0.200
Wholesome	Self-Perception	0.193	90	0.000
	Impression Average	0.096	90	0.040
Imaginative	Self-Perception	0.215	90	0.000
	Impression Average	0.067	90	0.200
Successful	Self-Perception	0.239	90	0.000
	Impression Average	0.080	90	0.200
Charming	Self-Perception	0.217	90	0.000
	Impression Average	0.076	90	0.200
Tough	Self-Perception	0.226	90	0.000
	Impression Average	0.068	90	0.200

Table 19

Independent Samples T-test Results

Category	Need to Belong			Need for Uniqueness			Athletic Identity			Fashion Consciousness		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	33.76	6.99	2.91**	33.07	6.57	3.26**	41.33	5.89	12.74***	13.04	3.47	4.91***
Impression Averages	31.45	2.76		30.32	4.53		29.51	6.54		10.90	2.27	

Category	Wholesome			Imaginative			Successful			Charming			Tough		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	3.70	4.47	2.36*	3.71	1.09	8.63***	3.59	0.87	8.03***	3.78	0.95	8.80***	3.08	1.05	3.40***
Impression Averages	3.40	0.38		2.62	0.48		2.78	0.39		2.78	0.51		2.64	0.65	

Table 20

Mann-Whitney U Test Results

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Sig.
Need to Belong	Self-Perception	90	103.05	9274.50	2920.50	7015.50	-3.23	0.001
	Impression Average	90	77.95	7015.50				
Need for Uniqueness	Self-Perception	90	103.88	9349.00	2846.00	6941.00	-3.45	0.001
	Impression Average	90	77.12	6941.00				
Athletic Identity	Self-Perception	90	127.21	11449.00	746.00	4841.00	-9.46	0.000
	Impression Average	90	53.79	4841.00				
Fashion Consciousness	Self-Perception	90	109.89	9890.00	2305.00	6400.00	-5.00	0.000
	Impression Average	90	71.11	6400.00				
Wholesome	Self-Perception	90	100.98	9088.00	3107.00	7202.00	-2.71	0.007
	Impression Average	90	80.02	7202.00				
Successful	Self-Perception	90	116.92	10523.00	1672.00	5767.00	-6.84	0.000
	Impression Average	90	64.08	5767.00				
Imaginative	Self-Perception	90	116.94	10525.00	1670.00	5765.00	-6.87	0.000
	Impression Average	90	64.06	5765.00				
Charming	Self-Perception	90	117.73	10596.00	1599.00	5694.00	-7.06	0.000
	Impression Average	90	63.27	5694.00				
Tough	Self-Perception	90	104.34	9390.50	2804.50	6899.50	-3.60	0.000
	Impression Average	90	76.66	6899.50				

Table 21

Active Sportswear Independent Samples T-test Results

Category	Need to Belong			Need for Uniqueness			Athletic Identity			Fashion Consciousness		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	32.68	5.13	0.60	33.39	7.26	1.47	41.77	5.86	5.40***	12.97	3.46	2.72**
Impression Averages	32.05	2.71		30.96	5.65		34.76	4.24		10.98	2.12	

Category	Wholesome			Imaginative			Successful			Charming			Tough		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	3.48	1.23	0.02	3.81	1.08	5.32***	3.74	0.86	4.61***	4.00	0.86	6.14***	3.42	1.06	1.83
Impression Averages	3.48	0.40		2.67	0.49		2.98	0.35		2.92	0.47		3.03	0.54	

Table 22

Casual Sportswear Independent Samples T-test Results

Category	Need to Belong			Need for Uniqueness			Athletic Identity			Fashion Consciousness		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	34.79	7.49	2.84**	32.69	5.52	3.36**	41.07	5.80	8.65***	12.69	3.63	3.67**
Impression Averages	30.52	3.08		28.58	3.60		28.62	5.14		9.78	2.27	

Category	Wholesome			Imaginative			Successful			Charming			Tough		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	4.03	1.05	3.06**	3.69	1.17	5.30***	3.52	0.91	4.94***	3.59	1.05	4.61***	3.00	0.96	2.46*
Impression Averages	3.41	0.34		2.47	0.42		2.63	0.31		2.59	0.49		2.48	0.60	

Table 23

Non-sportswear Independent Samples T-test Results

Category	Need to Belong			Need for Uniqueness			Athletic Identity			Fashion Consciousness		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	33.87	8.14	1.39	33.10	6.95	1.23	41.13	6.18	10.35***	13.47	3.41	2.20*
Impression Averages	31.71	2.31		31.34	3.61		24.93	5.94		11.89	1.95	

Category	Wholesome			Imaginative			Successful			Charming			Tough		
	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t	M	SD	t
Self-perceptions	3.60	1.07	1.36	3.63	1.07	4.23***	3.50	0.86	4.46***	3.73	0.91	4.76***	2.80	1.06	1.89
Impression Averages	3.32	0.40		2.72	0.50		2.72	0.42		2.82	0.54		2.38	0.62	

Results of the t-tests, and confirmation via the Mann-Whitney U test, indicated that there was a significant difference in the scores for all variables. For the need to belong variable, self-perception ($M=33.76$, $SD=6.99$) and first impression ($M=31.45$, $SD=2.76$) conditions were statistically different; $t(116.11)=2.91$, $p=0.004$. For the need uniqueness variable, self-perception ($M=33.07$, $SD=6.57$) and first impression ($M=30.32$, $SD=4.53$) conditions were statistically different; $t(158.11)=3.26$, $p=0.001$. For the athletic identity variable, self-perception ($M=41.33$, $SD=5.89$) and first impression ($M=29.51$, $SD=6.54$) conditions were statistically different; $t(176.08)=12.74$, $p<0.001$. For the fashion consciousness variable, self-perception ($M=13.04$, $SD=3.47$) and first impression ($M=10.90$, $SD=2.27$) conditions were statistically different; $t(153.11)=4.91$, $p<0.001$. For the wholesome variable, self-perception ($M=3.70$, $SD=1.14$) and first impression ($M=3.40$, $SD=0.38$) conditions were statistically different; $t(108.87)=2.36$, $p=0.02$. For the imaginative variable, self-perception ($M=3.71$, $SD=1.09$) and first impression ($M=2.62$, $SD=0.48$) conditions were statistically different; $t(122.28)=8.63$, $p<0.001$. For the successful variable, self-perception ($M=3.59$, $SD=0.87$) and first impression ($M=2.78$, $SD=0.39$) conditions were statistically different; $t(122.79)=8.03$, $p<0.001$. For the charming variable, self-perception ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.95$) and first impression ($M=2.78$, $SD=0.51$) conditions were statistically different; $t(137.33)=8.80$, $p<0.001$. Finally, for the tough variable, self-perception ($M=3.08$, $SD=1.05$) and first impression ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.65$)

conditions were statistically different; $t(147.96)=3.40$, $p=0.001$.

Additional t-tests were conducted to see exactly where the differences between self-perceptions and impression averages occurred based on clothing categories. Results can be seen in Table 21, Table 22, and Table 23. The additional t-tests indicated that in the casual sportswear category, all the variables showed significant differences between self-perceptions and impression averages. In the active and non-sportswear categories, the variables of need to belong, need for uniqueness, wholesome, and tough showed no significant differences, while athletic identity, fashion consciousness, imaginative, successful, and charming yielded significant results.

Comparisons between the First Impressions by Sport Type

The third research question intended to see if there were differences in the first impressions between each sport type. Results of the one-way ANOVA tests showed significant effect of sport type on athletic identity [$F(3, 950)=16.71$, $p<0.001$], successful domain [$F(3, 950)=4.76$, $p=0.003$], and tough domain [$F(3, 950)=13.61$, $p<0.001$] at the $p<0.05$ level.

Table 24

One-way ANOVA Results

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Need to Belong	Between Groups	99.007	3	33.002	0.582	0.627
	Within Groups	53911.816	950	56.749		
	Total	54010.823	953			
Need for Uniqueness	Between Groups	49.618	3	16.539	0.183	0.908
	Within Groups	85838.156	950	90.356		
	Total	85887.774	953			
Athletic Identity	Between Groups	5007.760	3	1669.253	16.711	0.000
	Within Groups	94893.646	950	99.888		
	Total	99901.406	953			
Fashion Consciousness	Between Groups	100.164	3	33.388	1.846	0.137
	Within Groups	17184.700	950	18.089		
	Total	17284.864	953			
Wholesome	Between Groups	3.829	3	1.276	1.328	0.264
	Within Groups	913.275	950	0.961		
	Total	917.104	953			
Imaginative	Between Groups	6.194	3	2.065	1.891	0.129
	Within Groups	1037.401	950	1.092		
	Total	1043.594	953			
Successful	Between Groups	12.909	3	4.303	4.757	0.003
	Within Groups	859.423	950	0.905		
	Total	872.332	953			
Charming	Between Groups	3.186	3	1.062	0.918	0.432
	Within Groups	1098.999	950	1.157		
	Total	1102.184	953			
Tough	Between Groups	60.897	3	20.299	13.606	0.000
	Within Groups	1417.339	950	1.492		
	Total	1478.236	953			

Comparisons were made within the significant variables of athletic identity, successful, and tough using the Tukey HSD test. For the domain of athletic identity, results indicated that the mean score for the impression score for weightlifting ($M=32.89$, $SD=9.94$) and soccer ($M=31.87$, $SD=9.88$) was significantly different than the basketball ($M=27.55$, $SD=9.65$) and baseball ($M=27.94$, $SD=10.82$) impression scores. However, the impressions scores for soccer did not differ from the weightlifting impressions, and basketball and baseball conditions showed no statistical significance between each other. In the successful domain, only weightlifting ($M=2.97$, $SD=0.99$) significantly differed from the basketball ($M=2.68$, $SD=0.97$) and baseball ($M=2.69$, $SD=0.94$) conditions. There were no significant differences between all other conditions.

In the tough domain, weightlifting ($M=3.17$, $SD=1.23$) significantly differed from all three of the other sports categories of Basketball ($M=2.47$, $SD=1.18$), Baseball ($M=2.47$, $SD=1.26$), and Soccer ($M=2.67$, $SD=1.24$).

Table 25

Tukey Post-hoc Test Results for Significant Variables

Variable	Type of Sport		Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
	(I)	(J)		
Athletic Identity	Basketball	Baseball	-0.389	0.973
		Soccer	-4.317	0.000
		Weightlifting	-5.334	0.000
	Baseball	Basketball	0.389	0.973

Successful	Soccer	Soccer	-3.928	0.000
		Weightlifting	-4.944	0.000
		Basketball	4.317	0.000
	Weightlifting	Baseball	3.928	0.000
		Weightlifting	-1.016	0.751
		Basketball	5.334	0.000
		Baseball	4.945	0.000
	Basketball	Soccer	1.016	0.751
		Baseball	-0.004	1.000
		Soccer	-0.184	0.091
		Weightlifting	-0.292	0.007
		Basketball	0.004	1.000
		Soccer	-0.180	0.208
Tough	Soccer	Weightlifting	-0.289	0.026
		Basketball	0.184	0.091
		Baseball	0.180	0.208
	Weightlifting	Weightlifting	-0.109	0.676
		Basketball	0.292	0.007
		Baseball	0.289	0.026
		Soccer	0.109	0.676
	Basketball	Baseball	-0.007	1.000
		Soccer	-0.208	0.167
		Weightlifting	-0.704	0.000
	Baseball	Basketball	0.007	1.000
		Soccer	-0.201	0.323
		Weightlifting	-0.697	0.000
	Soccer	Basketball	0.208	0.167
		Baseball	0.201	0.323
		Weightlifting	-0.496	0.000
	Weightlifting	Basketball	0.704	0.000
		Baseball	0.697	0.000
		Soccer	0.496	0.000

Discussion

The main purpose of the current study was to determine if a disparity existed in the first impressions made about the real everyday clothing choices of sports club participants. This section briefly summarizes the results followed by a discussion about the findings. Based on the discussion, theoretical and practical implications, limitations and directions for future research are discussed.

General Discussion

Comparisons between Clothing Categories. Research question 1 looked to compare the first impression judgments of the three clothing categories. The results indicated that there were in fact significant differences across the variables of need to belong, need for uniqueness, athletic identity, fashion consciousness, imaginative, successful, charming and tough. However, there were no significant differences between clothing categories for the wholesome variable. Post-hoc tests were used to identify specifically how each clothing variable differed for each clothing category. Overall, active sportswear and non-sportswear wearers were rated higher across almost all the variables, with the only exceptions being in the clearly athletic domains of athletic identity and toughness. Previous research has shown that fashion change agents (i.e., fashion opinion leaders, fashion innovators and innovative communicators) tend to have a greater need for uniqueness than

fashion followers (Workman & Kidd, 2000) as well as attractive people being perceived as having more positive traits than unattractive people (Dion et al., 1972; Snyder et al., 1977). Correlation analysis of the pairs of variables confirm these findings showing the strongest correlations between the pairs of variables of fashion consciousness and need for uniqueness, need for uniqueness and imaginativeness, fashion consciousness and charming, and finally imaginativeness and fashion consciousness, with correlation coefficients for these pairs ranging from 0.4 to 0.6.

Results in the blatantly athletic domains of athletic identity and toughness showed that for athletic identity, active sportswear was rated highest, followed by casual sportswear and lastly non-sportswear. This suggests that people do in fact judge based on clothing cues and notice the extent to which the attire is sport-oriented and use this information to infer other people's athletic qualities.

Overall, casual sportswear was rated lowest on most dimensions, which may be related to the perception in Korea in which tracksuits are tied to a 'baeksoo' image, which can be roughly translated to 'jobless' or 'bum' type of image, therefore being perceived as neither attractive nor fashionable.

Individual results for some of the variables also are of interest. For the first impressions about sports club participants' need to belong, the only significant difference was found between active sportswear and casual sportswear, with active sportswear wearers being rated higher in their need to

belong than casual sportswear wearers. Both clothing categories have a “sports” element as compared to non-sportswear, however, active sportswear clearly signals an intention to play a sport, or “dressed for action.” Casual sportswear on the other hand is worn generally for comfort and not necessarily for sport/movement. Therefore observers may have interpreted active sportswear wearers as belonging to some sort of sports team, and consequently given a higher rating for their need to belong as they fit the schema or category of ‘athlete’, while casual sportswear wearers are not easily categorized into one particular category. Non-sportswear wearers were rated as having the second highest need to belong, followed by casual sportswear wearers, although differences were not statistically significant.

This result can be explained by the lack of a reference group for the observers to reference in determining which group the particular target participant wished to belong to. The current study adds to the body of literature in the fields of person perception theory and gestalt psychology which support the notion that impressions are primarily formed through the process of categorization (Rosch, 1973; Hamilton, 1979, McArthur, 1982). Through the categorization process, the observer organizes the physical cues within the surrounding context or background and categorizes the particular individual, and therefore forms impressions by consciously or unconsciously treating him/her as similar to the people in that category, and different from other categories (Damhorst, 1990). In other words, in the eye of the observer,

active sportswear wearers clearly looked like they belong to a sports team or some sort of sports gathering, because there are not many other situations in which someone would dress “actively” to that extent. Meanwhile, the other two categories leave areas for guess work (i.e., business club, major, sports etc.). It is likely that casual sportswear wearers were viewed as just dressed primarily for comfort, meaning that they worry relatively less self-conscious, while non-sportswear wearers can be interpreted as generally conforming to the norms of their age group, or dressing to look good even if they have to give up some ‘comfort’ points in the process.

The results for the need for uniqueness also support this notion in that both active and non-sportswear wearers were rated significantly higher than casual sportswear wearers. In other words, casual sportswear wearers were generally viewed as not being unique. Social identity and optimal distinctiveness research focused on uniqueness or distinctiveness motives have shown that there are two levels in the pursuit of distinctiveness, group distinctiveness and individual distinctiveness (Hornsey & Jetten, 2004). In relation to the current study, without a confirmation of the guessed social group, observers may have been forced to categorize the targets in comparison to larger categories (i.e., people of a particular age group, the general Korean population, etc.). Of the three clothing categories, casual sportswear is the most ‘common’ category in terms of being worn by most age groups. To elaborate, active sportswear usually has a young, dynamic

image and non-sportswear wearers dress to the norms of the particular age group (in this case college students), meanwhile casual sportswear generally has less distinction in terms of style or brand between age groups, level of income or any other sociodemographic variables. This interpretation is partially supported by the results of the need for uniqueness variable.

Both active and non-sportswear were judged as having a higher need for uniqueness than casual sportswear. This means that the variations within the casual sportswear category were not seen as unique, or more generic and not representing any particular group to be compared with. Active and non-sportswear on the other hand have a smaller reference group and can be compared to other groups and are much more distinguishable.

Fashion consciousness results also have related implications. Results showed that all differences were significant, and non-sportswear wearers were rated with the highest fashion consciousness, followed by active sportswear and finally casual sportswear. Non-sportswear being rated higher than the other two groups is intuitive because sportswear is functional in that it requires comfort of movement and not necessarily dressed to “look good.” Active sportswear was rated higher than casual sportswear because the situational context in the observers’ minds was in a sports setting, while casual sportswear would have been a mix between a general context and sports context.

Comparison between Self-perceptions and First Impressions.

Research question 2 looked to compare the self-perceptions of sports club members with the first impression averages made by the observers. Statistical analysis showed that the self-perceptions were significantly higher than the first impression averages across all the variables. A deeper look revealed that the mean self-perception scores for clearly positive variables (i.e., imaginative, successful, charming) were higher across all sportswear categories, while somewhat neutral variables (i.e., need to belong, need for uniqueness, tough) showed the least difference between the self-perceptions and first impressions. Many researchers have concluded that individuals tend to overestimate or show self-assessment bias when asked about their own good qualities, relative to their assessment of others' qualities (Morse & Gergen, 1970; Brown, 1986; Diener & Diener, 1996), and this was no different for sport participants.

Social identity theory research concerned with consumer behavior has consistently concluded that self-identity or social identity congruence has an effect on consumer choice. The current research results show that although the person that consumes the clothing products may have chosen them because they feel there is some congruence present, the portrayal of such an image as it is perceived by others is quite weak.

However of interest was the result in the wholesome dimension. Wholesomeness showed no statistically significant difference between the

self-perceptions and first impression averages in the active and non-sportswear categories (.i.e, the only statistically significant difference was in the casual sportswear category). Taking a further look, the mean value for the self-perceptions of wholesomeness was not ranked particularly higher than other human brand personality variables (ranked 3rd of the 5 variables for both active and non-sportswear). However for the first impression judgements, wholesomeness' mean was ranked the highest of the other human brand variables. It may be that sports participants are generally viewed as being more wholesome, but further research is required to confirm such conclusions.

Comparison of Impressions between Type of Sport. Finally, research question 3 compared the first impression judgments by grouping based on the type of sport (basketball, baseball, soccer and weightlifting). Significant differences in first impressions were found only in the domains of athletic identity, successfulness and toughness. In each case, weightlifting club members were rated highest on all three variables. This results has to do with the special case of weightlifting in which most participants have muscular body type. Past studies have shown that mesomorphic (muscular) body types are often attributed the most favorable traits (Spillman & Everington, 1989; Yates & Taylor, 1978). This is most likely because 33.4% of weightlifting club members had muscular body types and compared to 13.0% for soccer, 5.9% for baseball and 5.7% for basketball.

Implications

Theoretical Implications. First impression studies dealing with clothing and their communicative and inferred characteristics has been dealt with quite extensively. Although studies have looked into many categories of clothing in various situational contexts, most research in the area has overlooked sportswear as a significant category, with the only exceptions being the studies that used a ‘sporty’ category which incorporated limited sportswear items. Therefore, this study adds to the field of first impression studies by taking a more micro look into a specific clothing category, in this case sportswear.

Secondly, real world usage of clothing was used, instead of forced manipulation. Most past studies would manipulate clothing on the target participant or stimulus subject’s end by requesting attire that fits a particular category. However, the current study gave no instructions on the user end, but rather categorized natural clothing choices in a situation context where a particular social identity would be salient. In other words, by visiting the sports club gathering without providing information about the details of the study, the sports club member identity would have been particularly salient that day, and target participants’ clothing choices were not affected in any way.

Finally, the current study was an attempt to shift the focus of sportswear studies from brand-centered comparisons to a style-centered comparison. Considering that most people do not choose one particular brand

to dress in from head to toe, as well as the overall image or impression of an attire most likely being different from the sum of its brand images, the current study provides preliminary insights as to the images portrayed and perceived through sportswear.

Practical Implications. As it relates to research question 1, results indicated that non-sportswear and active sportswear wearers were perceived more positively than casual sportswear wearers. These results suggest that for athletes, it may be more beneficial to dress in non-sportswear items off the field in public places to better their chances of being perceived in a positive light. For sportswear brands, it is suggested that they contrive marketing communications that may enhance the image of casual sportswear users, as well as improve designs to better the image of users. Also, for brands that may sponsor only a part of an athlete's attire, the current study emphasizes the importance of the overall look and how the sponsor's particular clothing items goes together with other clothing items of the athlete.

Research question 2 looked to compare the self-perceptions with the first impression averages, and showed that the difference between the two were highest for imaginativeness, successfulness and charming dimensions. Therefore, it can be interpreted as these aspects needing the most improvements, and sportswear brands or the sports industry in general should focus on communications messages that do just that.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The current study is not without its limitations. First, the study design did not incorporate a control groups. The purpose of the study was to look specifically at sports participants and their sportswear usage, but failed to account for non sports participants. Given that 90 photos of sports club participants were used, and the average time to complete a survey including three photos was about 20 minutes, adding a control group may have caused practical problems such as respondent fatigue or requiring a much larger sample size, and was therefore omitted from the study's design. However, this came at the cost of forfeiting a chance to compare the impressions of sports participants with non-participants. Therefore, further studies may wish to conduct similar research with a control group incorporated in the design.

Secondly, physical traits of the target participants were not completely removed. Although steps such as removing the background from the photos, adjusting the size so each individual was of the same height, and blurring out the faces were taken, it was impossible to remove the body type/proportions through the editing process. This was due to the fact that the current study wished to utilize real world clothing choices. However future studies may wish to compromise by having each target participant dress in all possible clothing categories to reduce the effects of body type.

Finally, the current study employed 9 variables of first impressions, which can hardly cover all aspects related to impression formation and

identity signaling through products. Past research has shown that impressions of others are formed in regards to a wide variety of traits and characteristics including, but not limited to, personality, emotions, economic status and ability in various areas (e.g., competence, skill level, etc.). Future studies can look into other variables and combining results may shed some light on to how sportswear differs from other clothing categories, and which aspects are most closely related to sportswear usage.

Conclusion

The current study investigated the communication of sports participant' social identities along with the first impressions formed of these sports participants in a no-aquaintance situation. Moreover, the study showed that significant differences in first impressions are present depending on the style of dress within the sportswear category. Overall, active sportswear and non-sportswear wearers were perceived more positively on most variables. The only exceptions occurred in the 'athletic' domains of athletic identity and toughness, in which were in the order of active sportswear the highest and non-sportswear the lowest. Also, by comparing the self-perceptions of the sports participants with the first impressions made by observers, the current study confirmed the existence of self-assessment bias in which self-perceptions were significantly higher than the impression judgments. Finally, by comparing the first impressions between the different types of sports, it

was found that there were no significant differences by sport type except in the variables of athletic identity, successfulness, and toughness, in which weightlifting club members were rated higher than the other 3 sports (baseball, basketball, and soccer).

In sum, the current study contributes to the body of knowledge on sportswear by theoretically and empirically examining sportswear with a focus on actual usage, rather than brand based comparisons. Findings from this research adds to the understanding of how sportswear wearers are perceived and provides valuable managerial and practical implications. The proposed recommendations provide important cues for future research and extends our knowledge on first impression formation and perceptions about sportswear users.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 347-356.
- Angerosa, O. N. (2014). *Clothing as communication: how person perception and social identity impact first impressions made by clothing* (Doctoral dissertation, Rochester Institute of Technology).
- Arai, A., Ko, Y. J., & Ross, S. (2014). Branding athletes: Exploration and conceptualization of athlete brand image. *Sport Management Review*, 17(2), 97-106.
- Ariely, D., & Levav, J. (2000). Sequential choice in group settings: Taking the road less traveled and less enjoyed. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(3), 279-290.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469.
- Asch, S. E., (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 33-35.
- Badea, C., Jetten, J., Czukor, G., & Askevis-Leherpeux, F. (2010). The bases of identification: When optimal distinctiveness needs face social identity threat. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(1), 21-41.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.

- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. London: Vintage.
- Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(4), 473-481.
- Belk, R. W. (1981). Determinants of consumption cue utilization in impression formation: An association derivation and experimental verification. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Belk, R. W. (1989). Extended self and extending paradigmatic perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(1), 129-132.
- Bell, E. L. (1991). Adult's perception of male garment styles. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(1), 8-12.
- Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 555-577.
- Berger, J., & Heath, C. (2007). Where consumers diverge from others: Identity signaling and product domains. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(2), 121-134.
- Berger, J., & Heath, C. (2008). Who drives divergence? Identity signaling, outgroup dissimilarity, and the abandonment of cultural tastes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(3), 593.
- Berger, J., & Rand, L. (2008). Shifting signals to help health: Using identity

- signaling to reduce risky health behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 509-518.
- Bhattacharjee, A., Berger, J., & Menon, G. (2014). When identity marketing backfires: consumer agency in identity expression. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(2), 294-309.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1993). Social identity, distinctiveness, and in-group homogeneity. *Social Cognition*, 11(1), 150-164.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pickett, C. L. (1999). Distinctiveness motives as a source of the social self. *The Psychology of the Social Self*, 14, 71-87.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (1991). Construct validity of the athletic identity measurement scale. In *North American Society for the Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity annual conference*, Monterey, CA.
- Brown, J. D. (1986). Evaluations of self and others: Self-enhancement biases in social judgments. *Social Cognition*, 4(4), 353-376.
- Bull, R. (1975). PSYCHOLOGY, CLOTHING AND FASHION-REVIEW. *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 28(DEC), 459-465.
- Buresti, F., & Rosenberger III, P. J. (2006). Brand personality differentiation

- in the Australian action-sports clothing market. *Marketing Bulletin*, 17(1), 1-16.
- Burke, P. J. (2006). *Contemporary social psychological theories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Burns, L. D., & Lennon, S. J. (1993). Effect of clothing on the use of person information categories in first impressions. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12(1), 9-15.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Guido, G. (2001). Brand personality: How to make the metaphor fit? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22(3), 377-395.
- Carlson, B. D., & Donavan, D. T. (2008). Concerning the effect of athlete endorsements on brand and team-related intentions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17(3), 154.
- Carlson, B. D., Todd Donavan, D., & Cumiskey, K. J. (2009). Consumer-brand relationships in sport: brand personality and identification. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 37(4), 370-384.
- Carlson, B. D., & Donavan, D. T. (2013). Human brands in sport: Athlete brand personality and identification. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27(3), 193-206.
- Cătălin, M. C., & Andreea, P. (2014). Brands as a mean of consumer self-expression and desired personal lifestyle. *Procedia-Social and*

Behavioral Sciences, 109, 103-107.

Chan, C., Berger, J., & Van Boven, L. (2012). Identifiable but not identical: Combining social identity and uniqueness motives in choice. *Journal of Consumer research, 39*(3), 561-573.

Chaplin, W. F., John, O. P., & Goldberg, L. R. (1988). Conceptions of states and traits: dimensional attributes with ideals as prototypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(4), 541.

Chernev, A., Hamilton, R., & Gal, D. (2011). Competing for consumer identity: Limits to self-expression and the perils of lifestyle branding. *Journal of Marketing, 75*(3), 66-82.

Cho, S. M., Kang, J. H., & Koh, A. R. (2010). Characteristics of extreme sports participants' lifestyles and sportswear benefits sought-A comparison between participants of extreme and traditional sports. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles, 34*(12), 2051-2061.

Choi, K. H. (2004). The types and aesthetic characteristics in the sportism expressed in modern fashion. *Fashion Business, 8*(1), 91-106.

Christman, L. A., & Branson, D. H. (1990). Influence of physical disability and dress of female job applicants on interviewers. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 8*(3), 51-57.

Cieslak, T. J. (2004). *Describing and measuring the athletic identity construct: Scale development and validation* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio

State University).

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Damhorst, M. L. (1990). In search of a common thread: Classification of information communicated through dress. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 8(2), 1-12.

Davis, L. L. (1984). Clothing and human behavior: A review. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 12(3), 325-339.

Davis, L. L., & Lennon, S. J. (1988). Social cognition and the study of clothing and human behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 16(2), 175-186.

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 629.

Diener, E., & Diener, C. (1996). Most people are happy. *Psychological Science*, 7(3), 181-185.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(3), 285.

Efran, M. G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Research in Personality* 8, 45-54.

- Englis, B. G., & Solomon, M. R. (1995). To be and not to be: lifestyle imagery, reference groups, and the clustering of America. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(1), 13-28.
- Escalas, J. E., & Bettman, J. R. (2003). You are what they eat: The influence of reference groups on consumers' connections to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(3), 339-348.
- Escalas, J. E., & Bettman, J. R. (2005). Self-construal, reference groups, and brand meaning. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(3), 378-389.
- Feather, B. L., Ford, S., & Herr, D. G. (1996). Female collegiate basketball players' perceptions about their bodies, garment fit and uniform design preferences. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 14(1), 22-29.
- Feinberg, R. A., Mataro, L., & Burroughs, W. J. (1992). Clothing and social identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 11(1), 18-23.
- Fishbach, A., Ratner, R. K., & Zhang, Y. (2011). Inherently loyal or easily bored?: Nonconscious activation of consistency versus variety-seeking behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 21(1), 38-48.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social Cognition* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Fridhandler, B. M. (1986). Conceptual note on state, trait, and the state-trait distinction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(1), 169.
- Fromkin, H. L., & Snyder, C. R. (1980). The search for uniqueness and

- valuation of scarcity. In *Social Exchange* (pp. 57-75). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: An exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 6(1), 49-65.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *Using SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gutman, J., & Mills, M. K. (1982). Fashion life-style, self-concept, shopping orientation, and store patronage-an integrative analysis. *Journal of Retailing*, 58(2), 64-86.
- Hamid, P. N. (1969). Changes in person perception as a function of dress. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 29(1), 191-194.
- Hamilton, D. L. (1979). A Cognitive-Attributional Analysis of Stereotyping¹. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 12, 53-84.
- Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(6), 895.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (1999). Subgroup differentiation as a response to an overly inclusive group: a test of optimal distinctiveness

- theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(4), 543-550.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Jetten, J. (2004). The individual within the group: Balancing the need to belong with the need to be different. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 248-264.
- Howlett, N., Pine, K., Orakçioğlu, I., & Fletcher, B. (2013). The influence of clothing on first impressions: Rapid and positive responses to minor changes in male attire. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 17(1), 38-48.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. K., & Roach-Higgins, M. E. (1987). Dress and physical attractiveness of women in job interviews. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 5(3), 1-8.
- Jung, S. H. (2006). A study on the aesthetics in Prada sports fashion. *The Research Journal of the Costume Culture*, 14(4), 529-541.
- Kaiser, S. B. (1985). *Social psychology of clothing and personal adornment*. Macmillan; Collier Macmillan.
- Kaiser, S. B. (1990). *The social psychology of clothing: Symbolic appearances in context* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Kaiser, S. B. (1997). *The social psychology of clothing* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Fairchild Publications.
- Kleine, R. E., Kleine, S. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1993). Mundane consumption and the self: A social-identity perspective. *Journal of Consumer*

Psychology, 2(3), 209-235.

Ko, E., Taylor, C. R., Sung, H., Lee, J., Wagner, U., Navarro, D. M. C., & Wang, F. (2012). Global marketing segmentation usefulness in the sportswear industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(11), 1565-1575.

Kwon, Y. H. (1987). Daily clothing selection: Interrelationships among motivating factors. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 5(2), 21-27.

Kwon, Y. H. (1994). Feeling toward one's clothing and self-perception of emotion, sociability, and work competency. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 9(1), 129.

Kwak, D. H., & Kang, J. H. (2009). Symbolic purchase in sport: the roles of self-image congruence and perceived quality. *Management Decision*, 47(1), 85-99.

Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2013). Construct validity of the need to belong scale: Mapping the nomological network. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(6), 610-624.

Lee, J. J., & Burns, L. D. (2014). Deliver knowledge or touch the mind? The effect of informational and emotional advertisement strategy on fashion sportswear brand attitude and recall. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 5(2), 135-148.

- Lee, H. S., & Cho, C. H. (2009). The matching effect of brand and sporting event personality: Sponsorship implications. *Journal of Sport Management, 23*(1), 41-64.
- Lennon, S. J., & Davis, L. L. (1989). Clothing and human behavior from a social cognitive framework Part I: theoretical perspectives. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 7*(4), 41-48.
- Lennon, S. J., & Davis, L. L. (1989). Clothing and human behavior from a social cognitive framework part II: The stages of social cognition. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 8*(1), 1-9.
- Lennon, S. J., Johnson, K. K., Noh, M., Zheng, Z., Chae, Y., & Kim, Y. (2014). In search of a common thread revisited: what content does fashion communicate?. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education, 7*(3), 170-178.
- Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition, and intergroup relations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 43*, 63-113.
- Lewis, L., & Johnson, K. K. (1989). Effect of Dress, Cosmetics, Sex of Subject, and Causal Inference on Attribution of Victim Responsibility¹. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 8*(1), 22-27.
- Lu, J. & Xu, Y. (2015). Chinese young consumers' brand loyalty toward sportswear products: a perspective of self-congruity. *Journal of*

Product & Brand Management, 24(4), 365-376.

Luyckx, K., Goossens, L., & Soenens, B. (2006). A developmental contextual perspective on identity construction in emerging adulthood: change dynamics in commitment formation and commitment evaluation. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(2), 366.

Luyckx, K., Lens, W., Smits, I., & Goossens, L. (2010). Time perspective and identity formation: Short-term longitudinal dynamics in college students. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.

Lynn, M., & Harris, J. (1997). Individual differences in the pursuit of self-uniqueness through consumption. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(21), 1861-1883.

Lynn, M., & Snyder, C. R. (2002). Uniqueness seeking. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, 395-410.

Maimaran, M., & Wheeler, S. C. (2008). Circles, squares, and choice: The effect of shape arrays on uniqueness and variety seeking. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6), 731-740.

Martin, D. S. (1978). Person perception and real-life electoral behaviour. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 30(3), 255-262.

Maslach, C. (1974). Social and personal bases of individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29(3), 411.

McArthur, L. Z. (1982). Judging a book by its cover: A cognitive analysis of the relationship between physical appearance and

stereotyping. *Cognitive Social Psychology*, 149-211.

McCracken, G. D., & Roth, V. J. (1989). Does clothing have a code? Empirical findings and theoretical implications in the study of clothing as a means of communication. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 6(1), 13-33.

Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism(MCST)(2015). 2015 Survery on Citizens' Sport Participation.

Morse, S., & Gergen, K. J. (1970). Social comparison, self-consistency, and the concept of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(1), 148.

Nam, J., Hamlin, R., Gam, H. J., Kang, J. H., Kim, J., Kumphai, P., ... & Richards, L. (2007). The fashion-conscious behaviours of mature female consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1), 102-108.

Naumann, L. P., Vazire, S., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2009). Personality judgments based on physical appearance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(12), 1661-1671.

Nielsen, J. P., & Kernaleguen, A. (1976). Influence of clothing and physical attractiveness in person perception. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 42(3), 775-780.

Nurmi, J. E., Poole, M. E., & Seginer, R. (1995). Tracks and transitions-a comparison of adolescent future-oriented goals, explorations, and

- commitments in Australia, Israel, and Finland. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30(3), 355-375.
- Paek, S. L. (1986). Effect of garment style on the perception of personal traits. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 5(1), 10-16.
- Palmer, F.R. (1993). *Semantics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, H. M. (2008). *Univariate analysis and normality test using SAS, Stata, and SPSS*. Technical Working Paper. The University Information Technology Services (UITS) Center for Statistical and Mathematical Computing, Indiana University.
- Park, S., Ahn, M., & Lee, Y. (2015). The study of dependence on sportswear and the effects of wearing sportswear. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 39(1), 77-90.
- Piacentini, M., & Mailer, G. (2004). Symbolic consumption in teenagers' clothing choices. *Journal of consumer Behaviour*, 3(3), 251-262.
- Rees, T., Haslam, S. A., Coffee, P., & Lavalley, D. (2015). A social identity approach to sport psychology: Principles, practice, and prospects. *Sports Medicine*, 45(8), 1083-1096.
- Roach-Higgins, M. E., & Eicher, J. B. (1992). Dress and identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(4), 1-8.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Toward a unifying model of identification with groups: Integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology*

Review, 12(3), 280-306.

Rosch, E. H. (1973). Natural categories. *Cognitive psychology*, 4(3), 328-350.

Ruvio, A., Shoham, A., & Makovec Brenčič, M. (2008). Consumers' need for uniqueness: short-form scale development and cross-cultural validation. *International Marketing Review*, 25(1), 33-53.

Satrappa, A., Melhado, M. B., Coelho, M. M. C., Otta, E., Taubemblatt, R., & De Fayetti Siqueira, W. (1992). Influence of style of dress on formation of first impressions. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 74(1), 159-162.

Shank, M. D. (1999). *Sports marketing: A strategic perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shim, S., & Gehrt, K. C. (1996). Hispanic and Native American adolescents: An exploratory study of their approach to shopping. *Journal of Retailing*, 72(3), 307-324.

Siibak, A. (2010). Constructing masculinity on a social networking site: The case-study of visual self-presentations of young men on the profile images of SNS Rate. *Young*, 18(4), 403-425.

Smith, C. M. (2014). *The projection of self versus perception of self: comparison of the meaning of clothing intended by the wearer and perceived by others* (Doctoral dissertation).

Smith, E. R., & Collins, E. C. (2009). Contextualizing person perception: distributed social cognition. *Psychological Review*, 116(2), 343.

- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(9), 656.
- Solomon, M. R. (1983). The role of products as social stimuli: A symbolic interactionism perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(3), 319-329.
- Spillman, D. M., & Everington, C. (1989). Somatotypes revisited: Have the media changed our perception of the female body image? *Psychological Reports*, 64(3), 887-890.
- Swenson, C. H. (1973). Role theory, *Introduction to interpersonal relations* (pp. 273-415). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Tagiuri, R. (1969). In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson, *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorization (English translation of "La Catgoristion sociale"). *Introduction á la Psychologie Sociale*. Paris, FR: Larousse.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 33(47), 74.
- Tepper, K., & Hoyle, R. H. (1996). Latent variable models of need for uniqueness. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 31(4), 467-494.
- Thomson, M. (2006). Human brands: Investigating antecedents to consumers'

- strong attachments to celebrities. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3), 104-119.
- Tian, K. T., Bearden, W. O., & Hunter, G. L. (2001). Consumers' need for uniqueness: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(1), 50-66.
- Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A. N., Goren, A., & Hall, C. C. (2005). Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. *Science*, 308(5728), 1623-1626.
- Todorov, A., Pakrashi, M., & Oosterhof, N. N. (2009). Evaluating faces on trustworthiness after minimal time exposure. *Social Cognition*, 27(6), 813-833.
- Vignoles, V. L., Chrysoschoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2000). The distinctiveness principle: Identity, meaning, and the bounds of cultural relativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 337-354.
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Developmental perspectives on identity formation: From adolescence to adulthood. *Ego Identity* (pp. 42-68). Springer, New York, NY.
- White, K., & Dahl, D. W. (2006). To be or not be? The influence of dissociative reference groups on consumer preferences. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(4), 404-414.
- White, K., & Dahl, D. W. (2007). Are all out-groups created equal? Consumer

identity and dissociative influence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(4), 525-536.

Workman, J. E., & Johnson, K. K. (1989). The role of clothing in extended inferences. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 18(2), 164-168.

Workman, J. E., & Kidd, L. K. (2000). Use of the need for uniqueness scale to characterize fashion consumer groups. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 18(4), 227-236.

Yates, J., & Taylor, J. (1978). Stereotypes for somatotypes: Shared beliefs about Sheldon's physiques. *Psychological Reports*, 43(3), 777-778.

Zebrowitz, L. A. (1996). Physical appearance as a basis of stereotyping. *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*, 79-120.

Appendix

Target Participants' Questionnaire

설 문 지

안녕하십니까?

바쁘신 와중에도 본 설문에 참여해 주셔서 감사합니다. 본 설문은 스포츠웨어의 활용과 스포츠웨어 소비자의 첫인상 형성에 영향을 미치는 요인을 조사하기 위함입니다.

대답은 맞고, 틀린 것이 없으니, 귀하께서 생각하시는 대로 솔직하게 대답해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.

귀하가 응답한 자료는 여러분의 개인적 사항이나 응답 내용 등은 통계법 제 8조 및 제 9조의 규정에 의하여 무기명으로 처리되며, 오로지 학문적인 목적만을 위하여 활용될 것이며, 모든 응답은 익명으로 처리 됩니다.

혹 이 설문에 의문사항이 있으시면 아래의 연락처로 문의해 주시기 바랍니다.

서울대학교 체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트 전공

지도교수: 임충훈

석사과정: 장지석

E-mail: giberish@snu.ac.kr

- 다음 문항은 귀하의 소속 집단에 대해 알아보기 위한 문항입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신에 대해서 기입해 주십시오.

아래의 빈칸에 대학 캠퍼스 또는 대학 환경에서 자신이 속해 있고, 또 그 그룹의 일원이라고 느끼는 3개의 작고 가깝게 소속된 사회 집단의 이름을 써주시기 바랍니다. 본인이 실제로 그 그룹에 소속되어 있는 사람이라고 느껴야 하고, 당신이 이 사람들과 잘 어울린다고 느껴야 합니다. 소속집단의 구체적인 명칭을 기술하여 주시기 바랍니다. (학과명, 동아리명, 등)	
1	
2	
3	

- 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 소속감에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	나는 소속에 대한 욕구가 강하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	다른 사람들이 나를 받아 주길 바란다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 혼자있는 것을 좋아하지 않는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	다른 사람들이 나를 받아들이는 것 같지 않으면 나는 신경이 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	나는 다른 사람들이 나를 피하거나 거부하게 만드는 행동을 하지 않으려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	나는 다른 사람들이 나를 위하는지에 대해 걱정하는 편이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	나는 필요할 때 내가 기댈 수 있는 사람들이 있어야 한다고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	오랜 기간 동안 친구들과 떨어져 있으면 신경 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	나는 다른 사람들의 계획에 내가 포함되지 않을 때 신경이 많이 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

10	다른 사람들이 나를 받아들이지 않는다고 생각하면 쉽게 상처를 입는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 독특성 추구성향에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다					매우 동의한다				
1	나는 독창적인 것을 좋아하기 때문에, 기성제품에서도 좀 더 특색 있는 종류를 찾으려 애쓴다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
2	흥미롭고 독특한 제품에 대한 나의 안목은 나만의 독특한 이미지를 만드는데 도움이 된다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
3	나는 제품을 구매하고 사용할 때 종종 기존의 관습이나 규칙을 따르지 않는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
4	나는 다른 사람들이 많이 산다고 알려진 제품이나 브랜드를 사지 않으려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
5	대체로 나는 다른 사람들이 습관적으로 구매하는 제품이나 브랜드를 싫어한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
6	나는 어떤 제품이나 브랜드가 일반 대중 사이에서 유행하게 될수록 그것을 구입할 흥미를 잃어버린다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
7	나는 어떤 물건을 사고 소유할 것인지에 관해서 내가 속한 집단의 규칙을 종종 위반한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
8	나는 남들이 따라할 수 없는 나만의 이미지를 만들기 위해 종종 내가 가진 여러가지 물건들을 함께 사용한다(조합한다).	①	②	③	④	⑤					
9	나는 어떤 특별한 제품이나 브랜드를 구매함으로써 나만의 개인적인 독특성을 개발하고자 적극적으로 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
10	나는 어떤 제품이 언제 어떻게 적절하게 사용되어야 한다는 내가 속한 집단의 사람들이 일반적으로 받아들이는 규범과 일치하도록 행동하는 경우는 거의 없다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					

11	나는 내가 알고지내는 사람들이 받아들이지 못할 제품을 구매함으로써, 그 사람들 사이에서 주로 유행하는 취향에 도전하는 것을 즐긴다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	나는 내가 가지고 있는 제품들이 일반 대중들 사이에서 인기 상품이 되면 그 제품을 잘 사용하지 않게 된다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 운동 및 스포츠 정체성에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다					매우 동의한다				
1	나는 자신을 운동을 좋아하는 사람이라고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
2	운동/스포츠는 내 삶의 중요한 부분을 차지한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
3	내 친구들 중 대다수가 운동을 좋아한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
4	다른 사람들은 내가 운동/스포츠를 좋아하는지를 쉽게 알아차린다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
5	지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 많은 생각을 한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
6	지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 분명한 목표를 갖고 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
7	스스로 좋은 기분을 갖기 위해 운동을 하는 것이 필요하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
8	내가 운동을 잘하지 못할 때는 나 스스로에게 좋지 않은 기분이 든다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
9	부상을 당해서 시합에 뛰지 못하거나 운동을 하지 못할 때는 많이 우울해질 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
10	운동/스포츠만이 내 삶에서 중요한 부분이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 패션 의식에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기
에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	패션과 스타일은 나에게 매우 중요하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	나는 일반적으로 새로운 스타일의 옷을 하나 혹은 그 이상 가지고 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 최신의 패션 스타일에 잘 따라가는 편이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	옷을 살 때 여러 가게에서 다양한 브랜드의 옷을 구입하는 경향이 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 이미지에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에
동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

잠시 시간을 내어 본인 스스로에 대해서 어떻게 생각하는지 생각하신 후에, 다음 단어가 어느 정도까지 본인을 설명하는지 표시해 주십시오.						
1	성실하고 건전한	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	상상력이 풍부한	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	성공적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	매력적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	터프한	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음은 간단한 인구통계학적 질문입니다.

1. 귀하의 태어난 연도는?	_____년생
2. 귀하의 성별은?	① 남성 ② 여성

3. 귀하의 가족의 월수입은?	① 200만원 미만 ② 200~300만원 미만 ③ 300~400만원 미만 ④ 400~500만원 미만 ⑤ 500~600만원 미만 ⑥ 600만원 이상
4. 귀하는 현재 대학교 몇학년에 재학 중입니까?	_____학년 ① 졸업 ② 대학원생/대학원 졸업 ③ 고등학교 졸업
5. 귀하의 전공은?	_____전공
6. 귀하가 소속되어 있는 동아리는? 구체적인 명칭이 필요합니다 (예: 축구, 노래, 토론 등)	_____동아리 _____동아리 _____동아리

○ 바쁘신 중에 조사에 참여해주셔서 감사합니다. ○

Observer Participants' Questionnaire**설 문 지**

안녕하십니까?

바쁘신 와중에도 본 설문에 참여해 주셔서 감사합니다. 본 설문은 스포츠웨어의 활용과 스포츠웨어 소비자의 첫인상 형성에 영향을 미치는 요인을 조사하기 위함입니다.

대답은 맞고, 틀린 것이 없으니, 귀하께서 생각하시는 대로 솔직하게 대답해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.

귀하가 응답한 자료는 여러분의 개인적 사항이나 응답 내용 등은 통계법 제 8조 및 제 9조의 규정에 의하여 무기명으로 처리되며, 오로지 학문적인 목적만을 위하여 활용될 것이며, 모든 응답은 익명으로 처리 됩니다.

혹 이 설문에 의문사항이 있으시면 아래의 연락처로 문의해 주시기 바랍니다.

서울대학교 체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트 전공

지도교수: 임충훈

석사과정: 장지석

E-mail: giberish@snu.ac.kr

- 다음 사진을 시간을 두고 보시기 바랍니다. 다 보신 이후에 다음장으로 넘어가서 질문에 답하시기 바랍니다.



- 다음 문항들은 앞서 살펴보신 사진속 인물에 관한 질문입니다. 귀하의 답변에는 맞고 틀림이 없습니다. 귀하가 생각하고 느끼시는데로 주관적으로 답변하시면 됩니다.

1. 본인이 생각하시기에 사진속 인물은 어떤 스포츠를 즐겨 할 것 같습니까? 우선순위로 3개 기입해 주십시오.	
1	
2	
3	

- 다음 문항은 앞서 보신 사진속 인물의 첫인상과 관련된 질문입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신의 의견에 대해서 표시해 주십시오.

항목		전혀 동의하지 않는다					매우 동의한다				
1	그는 소속에 대한 욕구가 강할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
2	그는 다른 사람들이 그를 받아 주길 바랄 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					

3	그는 혼자있는 것을 좋아하지 않을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	다른 사람들이 그를 받아들이는 것 같지 않으면 그는 신경을 쓸 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	그는 다른 사람들이 그를 피하거나 거부하게 만드는 행동을 하지 않으려고 노력할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	그는 다른 사람들이 그를 위하는지에 대해 걱정하는 편일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	그는 필요할 때 그가 기댈 수 있는 사람들이 있어야 한다고 생각하는 편일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	그는 오랜 기간 동안 친구들과 떨어져 있으면 신경 쓰는 편일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	그는 다른 사람들의 계획에 자신이 포함되지 않을 때 그는 신경이 많이 쓰일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	다른 사람들이 그를 받아들이지 않는다고 생각하면 쉽게 상처를 입을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 앞서 보신 사진속 인물의 첫인상과 관련된 질문 입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신의 의견에 대해서 표시해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	그는 독창적인 것을 좋아할 것 같으며, 기성제품에서도 좀 더 특색 있는 종류를 찾으려 애쓸 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	흥미롭고 독특한 제품에 대한 그의 안목은 그만의 독특한 이미지를 만드는데 도움이 되는 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	그는 제품을 구매하고 사용할 때 종종 기존의 관습이나 규칙을 따르지 않을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	다른 사람들이 많이 산다고 알려진 제품이나 브랜드를 사지 않으려고 노력할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	대체로 그는 다른 사람들이 습관적으로 구매하는 제품이나 브랜드를 싫어할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

6	그는 어떤 제품이나 브랜드가 일반 대중 사이에서 유행하게 될수록 그것을 구입할 흥미를 잃어버릴 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	그는 어떤 물건을 사고 소유할 것인지에 관해서 그가 속한 집단의 규칙을 종종 위반할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	그는 남들이 따라할 수 없는 그만의 이미지를 만들기 위해 종종 그가 가진 여러가지 물건들을 함께 사용(조합)할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	그는 어떤 특별한 제품이나 브랜드를 구매함으로써 그만의 개인적인 독특성을 개발하고자 적극적으로 노력하는 편일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	그는 어떤 제품이 언제 어떻게 적절하게 사용되어야 한다는 그가 속한 집단의 사람들이 일반적으로 받아들이는 규범과 일치하도록 행동하는 경우는 거의 없을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	그가 알고지내는 사람들이 받아들이지 못할 제품을 구매함으로써, 그 사람들 사이에서 주로 유행하는 취향에 도전하는 것을 즐길 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	그는 그가 가지고 있는 제품들이 일반 대중들 사이에서 인기 상품이 되면, 그 제품을 잘 사용하지 않을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 앞서 보신 사진속 인물의 첫인상과 관련된 질문입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신의 의견에 대해서 표시해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	그는 자신을 운동을 좋아하는 사람이라고 생각할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	운동/스포츠는 그의 삶에 중요한 부분을 차지할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	그의 친구들 중 대다수가 운동을 좋아할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	다른 사람들은 그가 운동/스포츠를 좋아하는지를 쉽게 알아차릴 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

5	그는 지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 많은 생각을 할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	그는 지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 분명한 목표를 갖고 있을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	그는 좋은 기분을 갖기 위해 운동을 하는 것이 필요하다고 생각할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	그가 운동을 잘하지 못할 때는 스스로에게 좋지 않은 기분이 들 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	그는 부상을 당해서 시합에 뛰지 못하거나 운동을 하지 못할 때는 많이 우울해질 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	운동/스포츠만이 그의 삶에서 중요한 부분일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 패션 의식에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	패션과 스타일은 그에게 매우 중요할 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	그는 일반적으로 새로운 스타일의 옷을 하나 혹은 그이상 가지고 있을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	그는 최신의 패션 스타일에 잘 따라가는 편일 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	옷을 살 때 여러 가게에서 다양한 브랜드의 옷을 구입하는 경향이 있을 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 앞서 보신 사진속 인물의 첫인상과 관련된 질문 입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신의 의견에 대해서 표시해 주십시오.

잠시 시간을 내어 사진속 인물에 대해서 어떻게 생각하는지 생각하신 후에, 다음 단어가 어느 정도까지 그를 설명하는지 표시해 주십시오.						
1	성실하고 건전한	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	상상력이 풍부한	①	②	③	④	⑤

3	성공적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	매력적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	터프한	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항들은 사진속 인물이 아닌 본인 자신에 대한 문항들입니다. 꼭 본인 자신에 대해서 기입해 주시기 바랍니다.

○ 다음 문항은 귀하의 소속 집단에 대해 알아보기 위한 문항입니다. 문항을 잘 읽어보시고 자신에 대해서 기입해 주십시오.

아래의 빈칸에 대학 캠퍼스 또는 대학 환경에서 자신이 속해 있고, 또 그 그룹의 일원이라고 느끼는 3개의 작고 가깝게 소속된 사회 집단의 이름을 써주시기 바랍니다. 본인이 실제로 그 그룹에 소속되어 있는 사람이라고 느껴야 하고, 당신이 이 사람들과 잘 어울린다고 느껴야 합니다. 소속집단의 구체적인 명칭을 기술하여 주시기 바랍니다. (학과명, 동아리명, 등)	
1	
2	
3	

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 소속감에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	나는 소속에 대한 욕구가 강하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	다른 사람들이 나를 받아 주길 바란다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 혼자있는 것을 좋아하지 않는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	다른 사람들이 나를 받아들이는 것 같지 않으면 나는 신경이 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

5	나는 다른 사람들이 나를 피하거나 거부하게 만드는 행동을 하지 않으려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	나는 다른 사람들이 나를 위하는지에 대해 걱정하는 편이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	나는 필요할 때 내가 기댈 수 있는 사람들이 있어야 한다고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	오랜 기간 동안 친구들과 떨어져 있으면 신경 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9	나는 다른 사람들의 계획에 내가 포함되지 않을 때 신경이 많이 쓰인다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	다른 사람들이 나를 받아들이지 않는다고 생각하면 쉽게 상처를 입는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 독특성 추구성향에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	나는 독창적인 것을 좋아하기 때문에, 기성제품에서도 좀 더 특색 있는 종류를 찾으려 애쓴다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	흥미롭고 독특한 제품에 대한 나의 안목은 나만의 독특한 이미지를 만드는 데 도움이 된다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 제품을 구매하고 사용할 때 종종 기존의 관습이나 규칙을 따르지 않는다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	나는 다른 사람들이 많이 산다고 알려진 제품이나 브랜드를 사지 않으려고 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	대체로 나는 다른 사람들이 습관적으로 구매하는 제품이나 브랜드를 싫어한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	나는 어떤 제품이나 브랜드가 일반 대중 사이에서 유행하게 될수록 그것을 구입할 흥미를 잃어버린다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	나는 어떤 물건을 사고 소유할 것인지에 관해서 내가 속한 집단의 규칙을 종종 위반한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	나는 남들이 따라할 수 없는 나만의 이미지를 만들기 위해 종종 내가 가	①	②	③	④	⑤

	진 여러가지 물건들을 함께 사용한다 (조합한다).					
9	나는 어떤 특별한 제품이나 브랜드를 구매함으로써 나만의 개인적인 독특성을 개발하고자 적극적으로 노력한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	나는 어떤 제품이 언제 어떻게 적절하게 사용되어야 한다는 내가 속한 집단의 사람들이 일반적으로 받아들이는 규범과 일치하도록 행동하는 경우는 거의 없다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	나는 내가 알고지내는 사람들이 받아들이지 못할 제품을 구매함으로써, 그 사람들 사이에서 주로 유행하는 취향에 도전하는 것을 즐긴다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	나는 내가 가지고 있는 제품들이 일반 대중들 사이에서 인기 상품이 되면 그 제품을 잘 사용하지 않게 된다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 운동 및 스포츠 정체성에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이
생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다					매우 동의한다				
1	나는 자신을 운동을 좋아하는 사람이라고 생각한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
2	운동/스포츠는 내 삶의 중요한 부분을 차지한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
3	내 친구들 중 대다수가 운동을 좋아한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
4	다른 사람들은 내가 운동/스포츠를 좋아하는지를 쉽게 알아차린다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
5	지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 많은 생각을 한다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
6	지금 하고 있는 운동에 대해 분명한 목표를 갖고 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
7	스스로 좋은 기분을 갖기 위해 운동을 하는 것이 필요하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					
8	내가 운동을 잘하지 못할 때는 나 스스로에게 좋지 않은 기분이 든다.	①	②	③	④	⑤					

9	부상을 당해서 시합에 뛰지 못하거나 운동을 하지 못할 때는 많이 우울해질 것 같다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	운동/스포츠만이 내 삶에서 중요한 부분이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 패션 의식에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

	항목	전혀 동의하지 않는다			매우 동의한다	
1	패션과 스타일은 나에게 매우 중요하다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	나는 일반적으로 새로운 스타일의 옷을 하나 혹은 그 이상 가지고 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	나는 최신의 패션 스타일에 잘 따라가는 편이다.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	옷을 살 때 여러 가게에서 다양한 브랜드의 옷을 구입하는 경향이 있다.	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음 문항은 본인 자신의 이미지에 대한 질문입니다. 본인이 생각 하시기에 동의하는 정도를 기입해 주십시오.

잠시 시간을 내어 본인 스스로에 대해서 어떻게 생각하는지 생각하신 후에, 다음 단어가 어느 정도까지 본인을 설명하는지 표시해 주십시오.						
1	성실하고 건전한	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	상상력이 풍부한	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	성공적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	매력적인	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	터프한	①	②	③	④	⑤

○ 다음은 간단한 인구통계학적 질문입니다.

1. 귀하의 태어난 연도는?	_____년 생
2. 귀하의 성별은?	① 남성 ② 여성
3. 귀하의 가족의 월수입은?	① 200만원 미만 ② 200~300만원 미만 ③ 300~400만원 미만 ④ 400~500만원 미만 ⑤ 500~600만원 미만 ⑥ 600만원 이상
4. 귀하는 현재 대학교 몇학년에 재학 중입니까?	_____학년 ① 졸업 ② 대학원생/대학원 졸업 ③ 고등학교 졸업
5. 귀하의 전공은?	_____전공
6. 귀하가 소속되어 있는 동아리는? 구체적인 명칭이 필요합니다 (예: 축구, 노래, 토론 등)	_____동아리 _____동아리 _____동아리

○ 바쁘신 중에 조사에 참여해주셔서 감사합니다. ○